

An amendment that sought to strike the section on prohibitions on aid to nations trading with North Vietnam;

An amendment that sought to end all aid and military credit sales to India (rejected by a recorded vote of 159 ayes to 223 noes with 1 voting "present");

An amendment that sought to insert "vital to the national defense" in lieu of "important to the national security" in a section allowing the President to approve CIA operations in foreign countries;

An amendment that sought to cut all funds authorized by 10 percent;

An amendment that sought to add a new section on control of Turkish opium;

An amendment that sought to reestablish the present \$150 million ceiling on sales of military equipment to Latin America;

An amendment that sought to reduce funds for international organizations and programs by \$13.4 million; and

An amendment that sought to limit contributions to the United Nations to \$156 million.

Subsequently, this passage was vacated and S. 3394, a similar Senate-passed bill, was passed in lieu after being amended to contain the language of the House bill as passed. The House then insisted on its amendment and asked a conference with the Senate. Appointed as conferees: Representatives Morgan, Zablocki, Hays, Fascell, Frelinghuysen, Broomfield, and Derwinski.

Pages H 11591 H 11653

Privacy Protection: House passed amended S. 3418, to establish a Privacy Protection Commission, to provide management systems in Federal agencies and certain other organizations with respect to the gathering and disclosure of information concerning individuals.

—Agreed to an amendment inserting the provisions of H.R. 16373, a similar House-passed bill. Agreed to amend the title of the Senate bill. Pages H 11661—H 11666

Late Reports: Committee on the Judiciary received permission to file reports by midnight tonight on the following bills: S. 663, to improve judicial machinery by amending title 28, United States Code, with respect to judicial review of decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission; and S. 1083, to amend certain provisions of Federal law relating to explosives. Page H 11666

Quorum Calls—Votes: One quorum call, one yea-and-nay vote, and five recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H11586, H11594—H11595, H11604, H11611, H11625—H11626, H11631, and H11639—H11640.

Program for Thursday: Met at noon and adjourned at 7:55 p.m. until noon on Thursday, December 12, when the House will consider the conference report on H.R. 16901, Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriations for fiscal year 1975; consider

the following two measures under suspension of the rules: conference report on H.R. 16136, military construction authorization; and H.R. 17597, Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1974; consider H.R. 16596, Emergency Jobs Act (open rule, 1 hour of debate); consider the following two bills under suspension of the rules: H.R. 17085, Nurse Training, and H.R. 17084, Health manpower; consider S.J. Res. 40, White House Conference on Libraries (open rule, 1 hour of debate), and H.R. 16204, Health Policy, Planning and Resources Development (open rule, 1 hour of debate).

Committee Meetings

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENTS

Committee on Agriculture: Met and ordered reported favorably to the House H.R. 17507, amended, to amend the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Act of 1974.

SUGAR PRICES

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing and Consumer Relations continued hearings on sugar marketing conditions since defeat of sugar bill. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

BANK FAILURE

Committee on Banking and Currency: Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance continued hearings on failure of United States National Bank of San Diego. Testimony was heard from James Smith, Comptroller of the Currency; and James Saxon, former Comptroller of the Currency.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

TORTURE IN BRAZIL

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements held a hearing on torture and oppression in Brazil. Witnesses heard were Rev. Fred Morris, former United Methodist missionary in Recife, Brazil; and Rev. J. Bryan Hehir, U.S. Catholic Conference.

FOREST RESERVES LEASING

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Met and ordered reported favorably to the House H.R. 10491 amended, providing for leasing of forest reserves for commercial outdoor recreation purposes.

The Committee discharged the Subcommittee on National Parks from further consideration of H.R. 2624, Hells Canyon National Forest Parklands, and the bill is now pending before the full committee.

Committee To Sit: Committee on the Judiciary received permission to sit during the 5-minute rule today.

Page H 11585

Antitrust Procedures and Penalties: House concurred in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to S. 782, to reform consent decree procedures, to increase penalties for violation of the Sherman Act, and to revise the Expediting Act as it pertains to appellate review—clearing the measure for the President.

Pages: H 11585—H 11586

Late Reports: Committee on Public Works received permission to file reports by midnight tonight on the following bills: S. 3934, to authorize appropriations for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code; H.R. 17558, to amend the act of May 13, 1954, relating to the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to provide for a 7-year term of office for the Administrator; S. 4073, to extend certain authorizations under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; and H.R. 17589, to designate the new Poe lock on the Saint Marys River at Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., as the "John A. Blatnik lock."

Page H 11586

Real Estate Settlement Procedures: By a voice vote, the House agreed to the conference report on S. 3164, Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974—clearing the measure for the President.

Pages: H 11586—H 11591

Farallon Wildlife Refuge: House concurred in the Senate amendment to H.R. 11013, to designate certain lands in the Farallon National Wildlife Refuge, San Francisco County, Calif., as wilderness—clearing the measure for the President.

Page H 11591

Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriations: It was made in order to consider tomorrow, December 12, or any day thereafter, the conference report on H.R. 16901, Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriations for fiscal year 1975.

Page H 11591

Foreign Assistance: By a yea-and-nay vote of 201 yeas to 190 nays, the House passed H.R. 17234, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Rejected a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report back to the House with a new section on Security Assistance and Human Rights prohibiting all aid until the receiving country demonstrates that it is not violating internationally recognized human rights by condoning such practices as torture or imprisonment without charge.

Agreed to:

An amendment that strikes \$85 million for the procurement of fertilizer by South Vietnam (agreed to by a recorded vote of 291 yeas to 98 noes);

An amendment that provides for a complete cutoff of military aid to Turkey until the President certifies to

Congress that Turkey is in compliance with the Foreign Aid and Foreign Military Sales Acts (agreed to by a recorded vote of 297 yeas to 98 noes);

An amendment that prohibits all aid to UNESCO until that organization refrains from adopting politically oriented resolutions;

An amendment that limits military aid to South Korea to \$145 million until the President certifies to Congress that progress is being made in expanding human rights in that country (agreed to by a division vote of 64 yeas to 44 noes);

An amendment that limits military assistance to Cambodia to \$200 million and limits all aid to that country to \$377 million;

An amendment that adds language requiring the strengthening of international nuclear safeguards and requires a report to Congress from the President on the efforts being made in that area;

An amendment that authorizes an additional \$25 million for famine and disaster relief in Cyprus;

An amendment that inserts "and until" after "unless" in a section prohibiting funds for CIA operations in foreign countries unless the President finds that those operations are necessary to American national security;

An amendment that adds language providing for the dispersal of assistance funds only if the receiving country agrees to trade strategic raw materials with the United States and providing for the stockpiling or sale of those materials by the Federal Government (agreed to by a recorded vote of 244 yeas to 136 noes); and

An amendment that adds a new section making it the sense of Congress that any country in default of a debt owed to the United States begin to pay off its debt.

Rejected:

An amendment that sought to withhold security assistance funds from any state until the receiving country demonstrates that it is not violating human rights by condoning such practices as torture or detention without charges;

An amendment that sought to reduce funds for international organizations and programs by \$26.6 million (rejected by a recorded vote of 165 yeas to 226 noes);

An amendment to the amendment limiting military assistance to Cambodia to \$200 million and imposing a \$377 million ceiling on all Cambodian aid that sought to raise the overall ceiling to \$527 million and to strike the \$200 million limit on military aid (rejected by a division vote of 29 yeas to 54 noes);

An amendment to the Cambodia amendment that sought to strike the \$200 million limit on military assistance and to exclude humanitarian and refugee assistance from the \$377 million ceiling;

An amendment that sought to add language allowing the President to withhold aid unless the receiving country agrees to trade strategic raw materials with the United States;

December 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11591

settlement fees, charges, and commissions to home buyers and home sellers.

The Secretary of HUD is directed to prepare and distribute special information booklets to help homebuyers better understand the nature and costs of all real estate settlement services. The booklets, which shall be made available by lenders to prospective homebuyers at the time of the loan application, will contain an explanation of the choices available in selecting persons to provide settlement services together with an explanation of unfair practices and unreasonable and unnecessary charges to be avoided by homebuyers.

Another important provision prohibits kickbacks given or received in connection with the referral of settlement service business to anyone. This outright prohibition will eliminate one of the most unconscionable abusive practices that characterize, in one way or another, a large number of settlement transactions in the Nation. The ultimate effect of kickbacks is to needlessly inflate the costs of homeownership since they are reflected in the cost of settlement services.

There is also a prohibition against requiring home loan borrowers from having to make excessive deposits in escrow accounts maintained for the purpose of paying property tax and hazard insurance premiums. This provision generally limits the amount that lenders can require homeowners to deposit in such accounts to equal monthly payments which will total no more than the taxes and insurance premiums owed at the time when payment is due. This will end the practice by a large number of lenders to require the deposit of amounts which total more than the tax and insurance payments which are actually due.

Still another provision will end the totally objectionable practice of requiring home buyers to pay a fee for preparation of truth-in-lending statements in connection with residential mortgage loans covered by this legislation. The information contained in such statements has to be developed by the lender for his own use and there is absolutely no reason to require payment for its disclosure by borrowers.

One of the most significant provisions included in the final versions of both bills directs the Secretary of HUD to implement model demonstration land recordation systems in various areas of the country in order to develop and promote acceptance of efficient, inexpensive methods by which real estate transfers are publicly registered. For the most part, recordation of real estate transfers are characterized by obsolete and extremely wasteful methods that make title searches and the retrieval of associated information difficult and needlessly costly. One of the key tools in such demonstration programs should be the use of data processing techniques.

This legislation will require the Secretary of HUD to conduct a study of the need for further congressional action to protect the interests of homebuyers and homesellers in settlement transactions. Among other things, the Secretary is specifically directed to make recommendations on the desirability of requiring

lenders to bear the costs of settlement services which would otherwise be paid by residential mortgage borrowers, and whether Federal regulation of settlement transactions covered by this legislation is necessary; and if so, how it is to be implemented. The Secretary is required to report his findings and recommendations to Congress within 3 to 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that these provisions, along with the satisfactory reconciliation of differences between the House and Senate bills, makes this measure a milestone in the history of consumer protection legislation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATING CERTAIN LANDS IN FARALLON NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, CALIF., AS WILDERNESS AND ADDING CERTAIN LANDS TO THE POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11013) to designate certain lands in the Farallon National Wildlife Refuge, Calif., as wilderness; to add certain lands to the Point Reyes National Seashore; and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 9 to 20, inclusive, and insert:

Sec. 201. Subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act of September 13, 1962 (76 Stat. 538), describing the boundaries of the Point Reyes National Seashore, California, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. (a) The area comprising that portion of the land and waters located on Point Reyes Peninsula, Marin County, California, which shall be known as the Point Reyes National Seashore, is described as the area within the boundaries generally depicted on the map entitled 'Boundary Map, Point Reyes National Seashore, Marin County, California', numbered 612-80,008-B, and dated August 1974, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior."

Sec. 202. The Secretary of the Interior shall, as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this title, publish an amended description of the boundaries of the Point Reyes National Seashore in the Federal Register, and thereafter he shall take such action with regard to such amended description and the map referred to in section 201 of this title as is required in the second sentence of sub-

section (b) of section 4 of the Act of September 13, 1962, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate adopted an amendment to the Point Reyes provision of the bill. It deletes the House language which added almost 170 acres to the seashore and specifically authorized the appropriation of \$200,000 for the acquisition of the lands involved.

In place of the House language, the Senate amendment increases the addition to the seashore by approximately 280 acres—making the total addition about 450 acres. The existing authorization ceiling for the seashore, we are advised, will be adequate to cover the acquisition costs resulting from this legislation so that the specific authorization in the House language is not needed.

In addition, the Senate language requires the Secretary of the Interior to publish an amended description of the boundaries in the Federal Register.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment is germane to the bill. While it will result in some cost increase—for the purchase of the additional 280 acres—that increase is not expected to be significant in relation to the total cost at this area which includes almost 65,000 acres of land.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER ON TOMORROW OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16901, AGRICULTURE-ENVIRONMENTAL AND CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1975

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow or any day thereafter it may be in order to take up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 16901) making appropriations for Agriculture-Environmental and Consumer Protection Agencies for fiscal year

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1974

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 17234) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 17234, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

H 11592

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 11, 1974

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, title I, ending on page 5, line 14, of the bill had been considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Are there any amendments to title I?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on Monday of this week, when the legislation providing \$412 million for a so-called replenishment of the Asian Development Bank was before the House, I tried to ascertain what borrowings the United States had made from the bank. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) insisted there were none.

In hearings on the subject this year, it was disclosed that the Asian Bank has a total of \$403 million, apparently in excess funds, for they are deposited in short term government investments. The hearings do not specify what governments have these funds.

According to hearings on the subject, in fiscal year 1966, when the United States made its initial contribution of \$140 million to the Asian Bank, that same amount of money was immediately loaned back. The U.S. Treasury paid 6 percent interest on the money it borrowed to give to the bank and another 6 percent to borrow it back—a total of 12 percent interest.

The Asian Bank loaned Thailand \$119 million and, although we had put up 20 percent of the bank's money, this handout Government of ours borrowed \$100 million from Thailand.

Incidentally, and from all faucets, we had pumped \$1,739,700,000 into Thailand through fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want the record to show the kind of financial hanky-panky that goes on with just one small part of this Foreign Assistance Act.

I realize that anything I may have to say here today on the disposal of this legislation will probably have no effect whatsoever, because a Santa Claus Congress has a habit each year of presenting foreign countries with a Christmas present of \$3 billion or more.

I think we should also understand here this afternoon that as of June 12, 1974—and we are being called upon to approve a \$2.6 billion foreign handout bill here this afternoon—we should understand that on June 12, 1974, the total foreign assistance pipeline stood at \$27 billion.

It is a pretty fancy Christmas present the Members will hand out here this afternoon if they vote for this \$2.6 billion to add to the \$27 billion in the pipeline.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. BADILLO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, in reviewing this legislation and the accompanying report I am deeply troubled to note that economic assistance may be made available to Syria under the special requirements fund if relations with that nation develop favorably. My grave concern stems from the continual harassment, intimidation and, in certain

instances, physical abuse and death, to which members of the small but courageous Jewish community of Syria have been subjected by the government of Hafez Al-Assad. I find it to be wholly inconsistent with our country's basic traditions to even contemplate aiding a regime which has meted out such cruel and inhumane treatment to a minority and which has continually ignored those basic human rights and civil liberties protected by international conventions, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—whose 26th anniversary was observed yesterday.

Surely we cannot condone the unconscionable actions taken by the Syrian Government against the Jewish community and, under existing circumstances, I believe that any consideration of assistance could only be interpreted as a tacit acceptance of such repressive and discriminatory policies. Clearly some meaningful commitment must be secured from the Al-Assad government that it will cease its ill-conceived reign of terror against Syrian Jews before 1 penny of aid under the special requirements fund will be made available.

The legislation before us contains language—thanks to the efforts of my colleague from New York (Mr. BINGHAM), which expresses the sense of Congress that no funds authorized by this measure should be provided to any country which denies its citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate. There can be no question that this language was accepted and incorporated into the foreign aid authorization because of the situation in Syria. Syrian Jews are virtual hostages in their own land and are unable to travel more than two and a half miles from their own homes without special permits, which are rarely granted. Inasmuch as the emigration of Jews from Syria is strictly forbidden, the current government there must drastically alter its policies in order to receive consideration for assistance. To do otherwise would make a mockery of this nation's most respected principles and those international agreements which seek to guarantee basic rights and human dignity.

As the report accompanying H.R. 17234 indicates, the U.N. Declaration on Human Rights could be used as a standard in evaluating the emigration policies of a Middle Eastern nation. It would be against this benchmark that Syria's policies would be judged in order to even receive consideration as an aid recipient under the special requirements fund. If such a specific requirement is not met and an attempt is made to secure aid for Syria, the Congress should not hesitate to fully exercise the concurrent resolution veto process under section 903(b) of the bill. There is no way in good conscience we could permit assistance to be furnished to Syria without first seeing substantive changes in that nation's emigration policies and the removal of restrictions against the Jewish community.

In view of the fact that Syria has a policy under which emigration is strictly forbidden, I would like to ask my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM), or the chairman whether

this amendment was intended to include the situation as it now exists in Syria.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would say that in the discussion in the committee, that was made quite clear, that this provision is directed at the situation in Syria. We are very much concerned about that situation. It is worse, if anything, than the situation which prevails in the Soviet Union.

The Jewish community in Syria is living in terror. They cannot leave; they are not allowed to leave. Therefore, this provision is directed precisely at that situation. I want to reassure the gentleman that that is the intent.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, and I commend him for his outstanding work in the committee and on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to title I, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—INDOCHINA AID

ASSISTANCE TO INDOCHINA

Sec. 5. Section 802 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 802. AUTHORIZATION.—(a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to furnish assistance for relief and reconstruction of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos as authorized by this part for the fiscal year 1974 not to exceed \$504,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$573,400,000, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"(b) No assistance may be provided to South Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos under part I (including chapter 4 of part II) of this Act. This prohibition may not be waived under section 614(a) of this Act or any other provision of law unless (1) the President, at least thirty days prior to the proposed waiver, submits to the Congress a statement containing the amount and source of the funds to be used under part I (including chapter 4 of part II), the use to which the funds are to be put, and his reasons for the use of the funds, and (2) during such thirty-day period the Congress does not by concurrent resolution disapprove the provision of such assistance.

"(c) The authority of section 610(a) of this Act may not be used to transfer funds into this part unless (1) the President, at least thirty days prior to the proposed transfer, determines and reports to the Congress that the transfer is important to the security of the United States and includes in his report the amount and source of the funds to be transferred, the use to which the funds are to be put, and his reasons why the transfer is important to the security of the United States, and (2) during such thirty-day period the Congress does not by concurrent resolution disapprove the transfer.

"(d) In addition to whatever funds may be made available under subsection (a) for the purposes of this subsection, there is also authorized to be appropriated \$27,700,000 for United States contributions to the International Commission of Control and Supervision of the Vietnam Peace Agreement."

ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAMESE CHILDREN

Sec. 6. Section 803(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by inserting after "fiscal year 1974, \$5,000,000," the following: "and for fiscal year 1975, \$10,000,000."

CEILING ON FERTILIZERS TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Sec. 7. (a) Not more than \$85,000,000 made available under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be used during fiscal year 1975

December 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11593

to procure agricultural fertilizers for, or to provide such fertilizers to, South Vietnam. (b) During each fiscal year after fiscal year 1975, of the total amount obligated or expended for such fiscal year under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to procure agricultural fertilizers for, or to provide such fertilizers to, foreign countries, not more than one-third of such amount may be obligated or expended to procure such fertilizers for, or provide such fertilizers to, South Vietnam.

Mr. MORGAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATHIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATHIS of Georgia: Page 7, line nine, strike "Not more than \$85,000,000" and insert therein "None of the moneys"

(Mr. MATHIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is relatively simple, it strikes the \$85 million that is authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act to provide fertilizer for, and the purchase of fertilizer for South Vietnam.

It seems to me to be utterly foolish for this Congress at this time to continue to provide assistance to South Vietnam in the way of buying fertilizer when we in this country do not have adequate supplies of fertilizer to meet our own demands, and when the farmers of this country who are fortunate enough to be able to purchase fertilizer are doing so by paying three prices for it, when and if they can get it.

So, as I say, the purpose of this amendment is simply to strike the \$85 million. It says that none of the money made available under the act of 1961 can be used to purchase fertilizer in this country, or abroad, for shipment to South Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that is the essence of the amendment. I think it requires no further debate, and I would simply urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, my good friend.

(Mr. GUNTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Chairman, not without a real sense of regret, and at least to some degree some measure of genuine anger, I will vote against passage of the Foreign Assistance Act. I say regret because I am not one of those who believes that the United States has no obligation whatever to those in other parts of the world who genuinely deserve and desire our assistance; but because, once again for still another year, we

have before us not a foreign assistance program that will help those genuinely in need, but simply another extension of the totally ineffective, unmanageable, and wasteful foreign aid program as it has existed in the past, siphoning off millions of dollars of taxpayer's money to go to corrupt regimes or to be diverted to some extraneous purpose having nothing to do with the genuine human needs of some of the world's poorest populations. Were American assistance directed toward helping those actually in desperate need and struggling on the brink of starvation without hope of salvation, I might feel our Christian responsibility and conscience would persuade us all that U.S. assistance was the right and humanitarian thing to do.

But, Mr. Chairman, once again, that is not the nature or intention of the assistance proposed in this foreign aid legislation, despite the increasingly clear insistence in recent years on the part of both Congress and the American people that our foreign assistance program be totally revamped from top to bottom in order to reflect the honest intentions and goals of that program as it was originally devised, rather than some perversion of the American spirit of generosity and the hard-earned dollars of our taxpayers for purposes never intended.

I particularly regret that a vote against this bill might be subject to misinterpretation as a vote also against those provisions contained in the legislation providing assistance for Israel. That is clearly not the case, Mr. Chairman. The aid designated for Israel will, without question, survive in whatever foreign assistance bill is finally passed in its final form. I am unequivocal in my vigorous support for the aid requested in this bill for Israel and in general, as I have been in the past and will continue to be in the future.

Aid to Israel, however, is not the issue in this bill, since any foreign assistance bill we finally pass will contain such aid, with my wholehearted support. What is at issue are all the other provisions in this bill not relating to Israel, and the question of what kind of foreign assistance in those instances can be truly justified and will be finally enacted along with the assistance provided for Israel.

Mr. Chairman, the clear mandate of Congress and the American people is again ignored in this legislation. The intense concern and even outrage which has been building over the waste and mismanagement of our foreign aid programs will no longer be denied. One would have thought that by this time the Federal bureaucracy and those responsible for drafting and submitting this legislation to the Congress would have heard and heeded the clear message, and revised this program so as to achieve the genuine goals of humanitarian assistance for which it was originally intended, to eliminate waste, and to submit a program which all Americans of good will could agree represented a sound, workable, and truly meritorious program of U.S. assistance to the most needy and deserving peoples of other parts of the world.

They have not done so, once again, Mr. Chairman. And I believe the time has come when Congress this time must make the message so clear and understandable that it will literally force a total review and revision of our foreign assistance programs to eliminate waste and mismanagement and to accomplish the true humanitarian goals which can be the only legitimate justification for such a program of foreign assistance.

It is no longer even a conservative or liberal issue, Mr. Chairman, but has come down to a simple question of common sense and fiscal and humanitarian responsibility. Not only the traditional conservative critics of foreign aid voice their growing anger and concern today, but many past liberal supporters of the foreign assistance program, such as the able Senator from Idaho, the Hon. FRANK CHURCH, have come to appreciate the folly of continuing to pour tens or hundreds of millions of dollars down the drain which never reach those whom it was intended we help by such assistance.

I can find, for example, Mr. Chairman, not the slightest bit of rhyme or reason for providing large-scale economic assistance to those same oil producing nations who now sit bloated and glutted with riches ripped off of the consumers of my State of Florida and the rest of the country in the form of outrageous fuel oil prices. It would be more appropriate for the oil producing nations to provide some economic assistance back to American consumers and to alleviate the suffering in our own economy produced by their extortionist policies of oil pricing than for us to send still more millions of dollars of so-called economic "assistance" to the oil producing countries like Venezuela now awash in their billions of dollars of newfound riches. This is the kind of policy, Mr. Chairman, which the American people, for good reason, simply cannot understand, and which I frankly cannot understand, and which I believe the Congress cannot understand.

With literally hundreds of thousands standing on the edge of starvation in many parts of the globe, I cannot understand, and I do not believe the American people can understand, the diversion of so many millions to countries where no such threat of starvation exists, or to prop up dictatorships around the world all out of proportion to any importance they have to the genuine security needs of our own country.

In voting against this legislation, Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important, however, that it be made clear what those of us who oppose it are saying, and what we are not saying.

As with any piece of legislation, there are parts of this bill I wholeheartedly favor and support. I believe it is imperative that we continue to provide adequate economic and military assistance to Israel. I favor the principle of selective foreign assistance in truly meritorious and deserving instances and where such programs of assistance are properly managed and the benefits of which reach those we actually intend to help.

But the time has passed, in my judgment, when we can continue the crazy-quilt patchwork programs of ineffective,

H 11594

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 11, 1974

wasteful and misdirected assistance at the waste of hundreds of millions benefiting those who least deserve our help and still expect that the American people are going to continue to tolerate even the concept of foreign assistance itself.

A vote against this legislation is intended, on my part at least, to serve as a clear direction to the administration to come back next year with a scaled-down, totally revamped program of genuine assistance to those truly in need of our humanitarian aid that can and will be managed efficiently and without the massive and misdirected waste that has characterized the presently existing program for far too many years now.

I believe Congress can force a complete review and revamping of our foreign assistance programs by voting against the pending legislation.

I shall therefore vote against this bill and urge my colleagues to do likewise, in hopes that we can force a total revision of the priorities contained in the foreign assistance program and come up with a totally new program that will merit and therefore achieve widespread support by all Americans who want to do the right and humanitarian thing—but who are tired of being taken for a ride in providing assistance for those who never seem to end up benefiting by it.

Without a return to commonsense in the operation of foreign assistance, Mr. Chairman, the concept of assistance itself is threatened even in legitimate circumstances, not by the program's critics, but by the administration itself by failing to benefit from that legitimate criticism and to produce a program that will have and merit the humanitarian support of the American people and the Congress.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. I yield to my dear friend, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

(Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me, and I rise in support of the amendment the gentleman has offered.

We have heard so much talk so many times in the United States on the high rate of inflation in the country, and it would seem to me that for us to be sending agricultural products that are so direly needed in the United States abroad under the guise of foreign aid while, as I say, we suffer here at home with the extraordinarily high prices of food, is just totally unnecessary. I hope the amendment will be adopted so that we can tell the American people and the American farmers and the American consumers that no longer are we going to be doing this, sending this to other countries who are so ungracious when we try to help them. It is time now to start taking care of the American farmer and the American consumer.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his contribution.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, in addition, that this is not strictly a farm-

oriented amendment, but that it also addresses itself to every citizen and section of our country, because they are the ultimate consumers of farm goods, because when we send \$85 million worth of fertilizer to South Vietnam it simply means that it is going to cost our farmers more to produce their products, and ultimately cost the American housewife more for the groceries she puts on the family table.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would say that, under the continuing resolution, AID has obligated slightly less than \$85 million to procure fertilizers for South Vietnam. These obligations under the continuing resolution will be charged to appropriations under the Foreign Assistance Act.

The \$85 million limitation in section 7 of the bill assures that no obligations will be made to procure fertilizer for South Vietnam for the rest of fiscal year 1975.

The gentleman from Georgia can be assured that there will be no loopholes, and that nothing more than the funds already obligated will be spent for fertilizer for South Vietnam.

However, we cannot change the facts, and we cannot bring back the unspent money that has already been spent.

So if the gentleman from Georgia wishes to insert the words "effective upon the date of enactment of this act" in front of the substitute language, the chairman would be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN) can tell me how much money has already been spent without the authorization of this act?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Georgia took part in the debate on the continuing resolution. I remember that the gentleman debated with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. On a very limited basis. I could not get time from the chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. The money was authorized and appropriated, and spent under the authority of that resolution. There is no money in this bill for fertilizer for Vietnam in fiscal year 1975. So I see no practical effect to the gentleman's amendment in its present form.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the observations and the comments and the contributions of the distinguished chairman, but I think it is time, once and for all, for this Congress to say that we will look after the American farmers and the American consumers first, and therefore I urge the adoption of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MATHIS).

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic de-

vice, and there were—yeas 291, noes 98, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 669]

AYES—291

Abdnor	Fulton	Parris
Abzug	Fuqua	Patman
Adams	Gaydos	Perkins
Addabbo	Gilman	Pettis
Alexander	Ginn	Pickle
Anderson,	Goodling	Poage
Calif.	Gray	Powell, Ohio
Anderson, Ill.	Green, Oreg.	Preyer
Andrews, N.C.	Gross	Price, Ill.
Andrews,	Gunter	Price, Tex.
N. Dak.	Guyer	Quie
Annunzio	Halley	Quillen
Archer	Hamilton	Railsback
Armstrong	Hammer-	Randall
Ashbrook	schmidt	Rangel
Aspin	Hanley	Regula
Bafalis	Harrington	Reid
Baker	Hawkins	Reuss
Bauman	Hechler, W. Va.	Rhodes
Beard	Heckler, Mass.	Riegle
Bell	Henderson	Rinaldo
Bergland	Hillis	Roberts
Bevill	Hinshaw	Robinson, Va.
Biaggi	Holt	Rodino
Blatnik	Holtzman	Rogers
Boland	Horton	Rooney, Pa.
Bowen	Huber	Rose
Brademas	Hungate	Rostenkowski
Bray	Hunt	Roush
Breaux	Hutchinson	Rousslot
Brinkley	Ichord	Roy
Brooks	Jarman	Runnels
Broomfield	Johnson, Calif.	Ruth
Brotzman	Johnson, Colo.	Ryan
Brown, Mich.	Jones, Ala.	St Germain
Broyhill, N.C.	Jones, Okla.	Sandman
Broyhill, Va.	Jones, Tenn.	Sarasin
Burgener	Jordan	Sarbanes
Burke, Calif.	Karth	Satterfield
Burke, Fla.	Kastenmeier	Scherle
Burke, Mass.	Kazen	Schroeder
Burleson, Tex.	Kemp	Sebelius
Burlison, Mo.	Ketchum	Seiberling
Burton, John	Kluczynski	Shipley
Burton, Phillip	Koch	Shoup
Butler	Kyros	Shriver
Byron	Lagomarsino	Shuster
Camp	Landrum	Sisk
Carney, Ohio	Latta	Skubitz
Carter	Leggett	Slack
Casey, Tex.	Lehman	Smith, Iowa
Chappell	Lent	Snyder
Chisholm	Long, Md.	Spence
Clancy	Lott	Stanton,
Clausen,	Lujan	James V.
Don H.	McCloskey	Stark
Clay	McCollister	Steed
Cleveland	McCormack	Steiger, Ariz.
Cochran	McDade	Stephens
Cohen	McEwen	Stokes
Collins, Ill.	McKay	Stubblefield
Collins, Tex.	McSpadden	Stuckey
Conte	Macdonald	Studds
Conyers	Madden	Sullivan
Cotter	Madigan	Symington
Cronin	Mahon	Synms
Daniel, Dan	Mann	Tacott
Daniel, Robert	Maraziti	Taylor, Mo.
W. Jr.	Martin, Nebr.	Taylor, N.C.
Daniels	Martin, N.C.	Thompson, N.J.
Dominick V.	Mathis, Ga.	Thone
Danielson	Mazzoli	Thornton
Davis, Ga.	Meeds	Traxler
Davis, S.C.	Melcher	Treen
de la Garza	Metcalfe	Udall
Delaney	Mezvinsky	Ullman
Dellums	Millford	Van Deerlin
Denholm	Miller	Vander Veen
Devine	Minish	Vessey
Dickinson	Mink	Waggonner
Dingell	Minshall, Ohio	Walsh
Donohue	Mitchell, Md.	Wampler
Dorn	Mitchell, N.Y.	White
Downing	Mizell	Whitehurst
Drinan	Moakley	Whitten
Dulski	Mollohan	Wiggins
Duncan	Montgomery	Wilson
Edwards, Ala.	Moorhead,	Charles H.,
Edwards, Calif.	Calif.	Calif.
Ellberg	Moss	Wilson,
Esch	Murphy, Ill.	Charles, Tex.
Evins, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.	Winn
Findley	Murtha	Wright
Flood	Myers	Wylie
Flowers	Natcher	Yatron
Flynt	Nedzi	Young, Fla.
Foley	Nichols	Young, Ga.
Ford	Nix	Young, S.C.
Fountain	O'Byen	Young, Tex.
Frenzel	Owens	Zion
Froehlich		

December 11, 1974

NOES—98

Arends	Frelinghuysen	Patten
Ashley	Gibbons	Pike
Badillo	Gonzalez	Pritchard
Bennett	Green, Pa.	Rees
Blester	Griffiths	Robison, N.Y.
Bingham	Grover	Roe
Blackburn	Gubser	Roncallo, Wyo.
Boggs	Gude	Rosenthal
Bolling	Hanna	Roybal
Breckinridge	Hanrahan	Schneebeli
Brown, Calif.	Hansen, Idaho	Sikes
Buchanan	Hays	Smith, N.Y.
Cederberg	Heinz	Stanton
Chamberlain	Helstoski	J. William
Clark	Hicks	Steele
Conlan	Hogan	Steelman
Corman	Hosmer	Stratton
Coughlin	Hudnut	Teague
Crane	Johnson, Pa.	Thomson, Wis.
Culver	King	Vanik
Davis, Wis.	Long, La.	Vigorito
Dellenback	McClary	Waldie
Dennis	McFall	Ware
Derwinski	McKinney	Whalen
Diggs	Mallory	Widnall
du Pont	Matsunaga	Williams
Eckhardt	Mayne	Wilson, Bob
Erlenborn	Michel	Wolff
Evans, Colo.	Moorhead, Pa.	Wylder
Fascell	Morgan	Yates
Fish	Mosher	Young, Ill.
Forsythe	Nelsen	Zablocki
Fraser	O'Neill	Zwack

NOT VOTING—45

Barrett	Hansen, Wash.	Pepper
Brasco	Harsha	Peyser
Brown, Ohio	Hastings	Podell
Carey, N.Y.	Hebert	Rarick
Clawson, Del.	Hollifield	Roncallo, N.Y.
Collier	Howard	Rooney, N.Y.
Conable	Jones, N.C.	Ruppe
Dent	Kuykendall	Staggers
Eshleman	Landgrebe	Steiger, Wis.
Fisher	Litton	Tierman
Frey	Lukon	Towell, Nev.
Gettys	Muthias, Calif.	Vander Jagt
Glaum	Mills	Wyatt
Goldwater	O'Hara	Wyman
Grasso	Passman	Young, Alaska

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—OTHER FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENTS

FOOD AND NUTRITION AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 8. Section 103 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$291,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975" and inserting "\$291,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, and \$471,300,000 for the fiscal year 1975" in lieu thereof.

POPULATION PLANNING AND HEALTH AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 9. Section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$145,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975" and inserting "\$145,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974 and \$165,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975" in lieu thereof.

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 10. Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 115. PROHIBITING USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—(a) None of the funds made available to carry out this chapter may be used in any fiscal year for any country to which assistance is furnished in such fiscal year under chapter 4 of part II (security supporting assistance), part V (assistance for relief and reconstruction of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos), or part VI (assistance for Middle East peace) of this Act.

"(b) The prohibition contained in subsection (a) may only be waived under section 614(a) of this Act or under any other provision of law—

"(1) if the President submits to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a statement containing (A) the amount of funds under this chapter to be made available which, but for such waiver, would have been prohibited from being made available, (B) the country for which such funds are to be made available, (C) the purpose for which such funds are to be made available for such country, and (D) the reason that funds from this chapter must be made available for such purpose; and

"(2) during the thirty-day period after the President submits such report, Congress does not pass a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the proposed use of such funds.

"(c) This section shall not apply to funds made available under section 104 for purposes of title X of chapter 2 of this part (programs relating to population growth)."

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT PROGRAMS

SEC. 11. (a) Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by deleting the title heading and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE III—HOUSING AND OTHER CREDIT GUARANTY PROGRAMS";

(2) by inserting at the end of section 222 the following new section:

"SEC. 222A. AGRICULTURAL AND PRODUCTIVE CREDIT AND SELF-HELP COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.—(a) It is the sense of the Congress that in order to stimulate the participation of the private sector in the economic development of less-developed countries in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be used to establish pilot programs in not more than five Latin American countries to encourage private banks, credit institutions, similar private lending organizations, cooperatives, and private nonprofit development organizations to make loans on reasonable terms to organized groups and individuals residing in a community for the purpose of enabling such groups and individuals to carry out agricultural credit and self-help community development projects for which they are unable to obtain financial assistance on reasonable terms. Agricultural credit and assistance for self-help community development projects should include, but not be limited to, material and such projects as wells, pumps, farm machinery, improved seed, fertilizer, pesticides, vocational training, food industry development, nutrition projects, improved breeding stock for farm animals, sanitation facilities, and looms and other handicraft aids.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the agency primarily responsible for administering part I is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as it shall determine, to private lending institutions, cooperatives, and private nonprofit development organizations in not more than five Latin American countries assuring against loss of not to exceed 50 per centum of the portfolio of such loans made by any lender to organized groups or individuals residing in a community to enable such groups or individuals to carry out agricultural credit and self-help community development projects for which they are unable to obtain financial assistance on reasonable terms. In no event shall the liability of the United States exceed 75 per centum of any one loan.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$15,000,000. Not more than 10 per centum of such sum shall be provided for any one institution, cooperative, or organization.

"(d) The Inter-American Foundation shall be consulted in developing criteria for mak-

ing loans eligible for guaranty coverage in Latin America under this section.

"(e) Not to exceed \$3,000,000 of the guaranty reserve established under section 223 (b) shall be available to make such payments as may be necessary to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under this section or any guaranties previously issued under section 240 of this Act.

"(f) Funds held by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation pursuant to section 236 may be available for meeting necessary administrative and operating expenses for carrying out the provisions of this section through June 30, 1976.

"(g) The Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall, upon enactment of this subsection, transfer to the agency primarily responsible for administering part I all obligations, assets, and related rights and responsibilities arising out of, or related to the predecessor program provided for in section 240 of this Act.

"(h) The authority of this section shall continue until December 31, 1977.

"(i) Notwithstanding the limitation in subsection (c) of this section, foreign currencies owned by the United States and determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be excess to the needs of the United States may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this section, including the discharge of liabilities under this subsection. The authority conferred by this subsection shall be in addition to authority conferred by any other provision of law to implement guaranty programs utilizing excess local currency.

"(j) The President shall, on or before January 15, 1976, make a detailed report to the Congress on the results of the programs established under this section, together with such recommendations as he may deem appropriate."

(3) by deleting "section 221 or section 222" in section 223(a) and inserting "section 221, 222, or 222A" in lieu thereof;

(4) by deleting "this title" in section 223(b) and inserting "section 221 and section 222" in lieu thereof; and

(5) by deleting "section 221 or section 222" in section 223(d) and inserting "section 221, 222, or 222A" in lieu thereof.

(b) Title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out section 240.

HOUSING GUARANTIES

SEC. 12. Section 223(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1975" and inserting "June 30, 1976" in lieu thereof.

POPULATION GROWTH EARMARKING

SEC. 13. Section 292 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$130,000,000" and inserting "\$150,000,000" in lieu thereof.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 14. (a) Section 302(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out the words "for the fiscal year 1975, \$150,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year 1975, \$154,400,000".

(b) Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Of the funds made available to carry out this chapter for fiscal year 1975, in addition to any other such funds to be made available for contributions to the International Atomic Energy Agency, not less than \$500,000 shall be made available to such Agency as technical assistance in kind."

SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

SEC. 15. Chapter 1 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 502B. HUMAN RIGHTS.—(a) It is the sense of Congress that, except in extraordi-

H 11596

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 11, 1974

nary circumstances, the President shall substantially reduce or terminate security assistance to any government which engages in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, including torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; prolonged detention without charges; or other flagrant denials of the right to life, liberty, and the security of the person.

"(b) Whenever proposing or furnishing security assistance to any government falling within the provisions of paragraph (a), the President shall advise the Congress of the extraordinary circumstances necessitating the assistance.

"(c) In determining whether or not a government falls within the provisions of subsection (a), consideration shall be given to the extent of cooperation by such government in permitting an unimpeded investigation of alleged violations of internationally recognized human rights by appropriate international organizations, including the International Committee of the Red Cross and any body acting under the authority of the United Nations or of the Organization of American States.

"(d) For purposes of this section, 'security assistance' means assistance under chapter 2 (military assistance) or chapter 4 (security supporting assistance) of this part, assistance under part V (Indochina Postwar Reconstruction) or part VI (Middle East Peace) of this Act, sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act, or assistance for public safety under this or any other Act."

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

SEC. 18. (a) Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) In section 504(a), strike out "\$12,500,000 for the fiscal year 1974" and insert in lieu thereof "\$745,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975, of which not less than \$100,000,000 shall be made available for Israel."

(2) In section 504(a), strike out "(other than training in the United States)" and insert in lieu thereof "(other than (1) training in the United States, or (2) for Western Hemisphere countries, training in the United States or in the Canal Zone)".

(3) In section 506(a), strike out "the fiscal year 1974" in each place it appears and insert in lieu thereof "the fiscal year 1975".

(4) In section 513—

(A) Strike out "AND LOAS" in the section heading and insert "LAOS, AND VIETNAM" in lieu thereof; and

(B) Add at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) After June 30, 1975, no military assistance shall be furnished by the United States to Vietnam directly or through any other foreign country unless that assistance is authorized under this Act or the Foreign Military Sales Act."

(b) Section 655(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply to assistance authorized under any provision of law for the fiscal year 1975.

CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TRANSFER

SEC. 17. Section 511 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"It is the sense of Congress that the President should develop and propose as soon as possible at the appropriate international forum a United States draft international agreement for regulating the transfer of conventional weapons among the governments of the world."

SECURITY SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 18. Section 532 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year 1974 not to exceed \$125,000,000, of which not less than \$50,000,000 shall be available solely for Israel and inserting in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$585,000,000.

PROHIBITIONS ON AID TO NATIONS TRADING WITH NORTH VIETNAM

SEC. 19. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by inserting before the period in subsection (n) the following: "unless the President determines that such loans, credits, guaranties, grants, other assistance, or sales are in the national interest of the United States".

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE

SEC. 20. Section 620(v) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is repealed.

SUSPENSION OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 20. Section 620(v) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(x) All military assistance, all sales of defense articles and services (whether for cash or by credit, guaranty, or any other means), and all licenses with respect to the transportation of arms, ammunitions, and implements of war (including technical data relating thereto) to the Government of Turkey shall be suspended on the date of enactment of this subsection unless and until the President determines and certifies to the Congress that the Government of Turkey is making a substantial good faith effort to achieve a negotiated settlement with respect to Cyprus."

SUSPENSION OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO CHILE

SEC. 22. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(y) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), all military assistance, all sales of defense articles and services (whether for cash or by credit, guaranty, or any other means), and all licenses with respect to the transportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war (including technical data relating thereto) to the Government of Chile under this or any other law shall be suspended for the period from the date of enactment of this subsection through the end of fiscal year 1975.

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), training may be furnished pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in the United States or the Canal Zone to members of the armed forces of Chile in an amount not to exceed \$800,000 for fiscal year 1975.

"(3) The provisions of subsection (y) (1) shall cease to apply when the President reports to the Congress that the Government of Chile has made and is continuing to make fundamental improvements in the observance and enforcement of internationally recognized human rights: *Provided*, That the total amount of credits furnished or guaranteed under the Foreign Military Sales Act, and of any disposal of vessels made in accordance with section 7307 of title X of the United States Code, to Chile during fiscal year 1975 shall not exceed \$10,000,000."

EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLE VALUE IN ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 23. Section 634(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "including economic assistance and military grants and sales" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "including economic assistance, military grants (and including for any such grant of any excess defense article, the value of such article expressed in terms of its acquisition cost to the United States), and military sales."

FAMINE OR DISASTER RELIEF

SEC. 24. (a) Section 639 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, dealing with famine or disaster relief, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 639. FAMINE OR DISASTER RELIEF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act, the President may provide

famine or disaster relief assistance to any foreign country on such terms and conditions as he may determine. For fiscal year 1975 there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$15,000,000, to provide such assistance. The President shall submit quarterly reports during such fiscal year to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the programing and obligation of funds under this section."

(b) Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, dealing with the contingency fund, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 451. CONTINGENCY FUND.—(a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$5,000,000, to provide assistance authorized by this part or by section 639 for any emergency purpose only in accordance with the provisions applicable to the furnishing of such assistance.

"(b) The President shall submit quarterly reports to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the programing and obligation of funds under this section.

"(c) No part of this fund shall be used to pay for any gifts to any officials of any foreign government made heretofore or hereafter."

CHANGE IN ALLOCATION OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

SEC. 25. Section 653 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by striking out all after the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (a); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and by inserting immediately after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no military grant assistance, security supporting assistance, assistance under chapter 1 of part I of this Act, or assistance under part V of this Act, may be furnished to any country or international organization in any fiscal year, if such assistance exceeds by 10 percent or more the amount of such military grant assistance, security supporting assistance, assistance under chapter 1 of part I of this Act, or assistance under part V of this Act, as the case may be, set forth in the report required by subsection (a) of this section, unless—

"(1) the President reports to the Congress, at least thirty days prior to the date on which such excess funds are provided, the country or organization to be provided the excess funds, the amount and category of the excess funds, and the justification for providing the excess funds; and

"(2) in the case of military grant assistance or security supporting assistance, the President includes in the report under paragraph (1) his determination that it is in the security interests of the United States to provide the excess funds.

This subsection shall not apply if the excess funds provided in any fiscal year to any country or international organization for any category of assistance are less than \$1,000,000."

VOLUNTARY PERSONNEL IN CAMBODIA

SEC. 26. Section 656 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "This section shall not be construed to apply to employees of United States voluntary non-profit relief agencies registered with and approved by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid or to employees of the International Committee of the Red Cross."

REIMBURSABLE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND LIMITING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 27. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end of part III the following new sections:

SEC. 659. REIMBURSABLE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.—The President is authorized to use up to \$2,000,000 of the funds made available for the purposes of this Act in each of the fiscal years 1975 and 1976 to work with friendly countries, especially those in which United States development programs have been concluded or those not receiving assistance under part I of this Act, in (1) facilitating open and fair access to natural resources of interest to the United States and (2) stimulation of reimbursable aid programs consistent with part I of this Act. Any funds used for purposes of this section may be used notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 660. LIMITATION ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—(a) No funds appropriated under the authority of this or any other Act may be expended by or on behalf of the Central Intelligence Agency for operations in foreign countries, other than activities intended solely for obtaining necessary intelligence, unless the President finds that each such operation is important to the national security of the United States and reports, in a timely fashion, a description and scope of such operation to the appropriate committees of the Congress, including the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply during military operations initiated by the United States under a declaration of war approved by the Congress or an exercise of powers by the President under the War Powers Resolution."

LIMITATION ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES TO KOREA

SEC. 28. Notwithstanding any other provision of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961—

(1) not more than \$100,000,000 shall be used in fiscal year 1975 to carry out any program of military assistance to Korea under such Act of 1961; and

(2) not more than \$15,000,000 shall be used in fiscal year 1975 to provide excess defense articles to Korea under such Act of 1961.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR INDIA

SEC. 29. The total amount of assistance provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and of credit sales made or guaranteed under the Foreign Military Sales Act for India shall not exceed \$50,000,000 in fiscal year 1975.

Mr. MORGAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 14, strike out line 5 down through line 12 on page 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

SEC. 15. Chapter 1 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 502B. Human Rights.—(a) For each fiscal year, after the date of enactment of this section, no security assistance may be obligated or expended for any country under this Act and no sale of any defense article or service (whether for cash or by credit,

guaranty, or any other means) may be made to any country under the Foreign Military Sales Act until—

"(1) the President certifies to the Congress that such country is satisfactorily observing internationally recognized standards of human rights with respect to its citizens; and

"(2) the passage of thirty days after such certification under paragraph (1), during which the Congress does not adopt a concurrent resolution disapproving such certification.

The certification under paragraph (1) shall occur within thirty days after the beginning of each fiscal year, except that for fiscal year 1975 such certification shall occur within 60 days after the date of enactment of this section.

"(b) For purposes of this section, 'security assistance' means assistance under chapter 2 (military assistance) or chapter 4 (security supporting assistance) of this part, assistance under part V (Indochina Postwar Reconstruction) or part VI (Middle East Peace) of this Act, sales and guarantees of such sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act, and assistance for public safety under this Act."

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, either Congress means business about the practice of human rights, or it does not. Last year Congress wrote into law an amendment, and I quote:

It is a sense of Congress that the President should deny any economic or military assistance to the Government of any foreign country which practices the internment or imprisonment of that country's citizens for political purposes.

Last year Congress also included one of those fancy "sense of Congress" statements on human rights regarding Chile.

How many countries have been denied aid as a result of those pronouncements? Does any Member know of any? I would appreciate it if anyone would tell me of a country that has been denied aid for failing to provide human rights to its citizens.

There is no more reason to expect that another "sense of Congress" expression will have any more effect than last year's statements.

The President and the executive branch are in the best position to make a judgment about what is going on in each country. The President understands what human rights are. At least he should.

My amendment allows Congress to determine the accuracy of the President's judgment. It gives Congress veto power if he does not properly exercise denial of aid, military aid, supporting assistance, and some economic assistance.

The American people are sensitive to human rights. My amendment allows Members of Congress an opportunity to put some backbone in this aid program if it is to be approved.

Looking at the report and the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), in opposition to this bill, let me quote. He said:

Every year until this year I have voted for foreign assistance bills in committee and on the floor of the House, but always with strong reservations against many of the provisions for military assistance. I continue to believe that the United States has a major respon-

sibility to provide economic and humanitarian assistance to the developing countries. However, I cannot support this bill because the executive branch has made it abundantly clear that it intends to give the maximum amount of military aid no matter how cruelly repressive recipient governments might be.

I cannot think of a stronger indictment with respect to human rights than the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota. But now the gentleman from Minnesota, in a letter circulated to the Members, is saying that if certain compromises concerning South Vietnam are worked out he will then be able to overlook, as far as this bill is concerned, depriving others of their human rights around the world.

I cannot believe there is a Member in this House who would put this kind of a price tag on human rights. I say to the Members here and now, especially those Members who are constantly talking about human rights, here is your opportunity to do something about it. Let us see those Members step up to the platter with an "aye" vote on behalf of this amendment which is fair to citizens around the world who are the beneficiaries of this foreign aid bill.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on the face of it the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, would appear to be attractive to those of us who are concerned about human rights. However, a more careful examination of the amendment which the gentleman proposes, comparing that with the language that is in the bill, suggests why it would not be wise to adopt the amendment.

In the first instance, the bill uses this language: it refers to consistent patterns of "gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, including torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; prolonged detention without charges; or other flagrant denials of the right to life, liberty, and the security of the person."

What the committee bill seeks to do is to direct the attention of the administration to those most fundamental of all human rights, the right to the integrity of one's person, the right not to be tortured, and the right not to be subjected to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, because every nation on Earth agrees with this fundamental position that torture or degrading treatment is not permissible. So we seek to direct the attention of the administration to those kinds of violations of human rights.

Mr. Chairman, the problem with the amendment offered by our friend, the gentleman from Iowa, is that it reaches too broadly and suggests that all countries have got to make good on everything all at once in order that we may continue to provide assistance. In my judgment, that is not realistic.

Most countries around the world do limit the right of free press and the right of free political association, and they limit other rights to some degree. However, we are not trying to reach those rights with our committee language; we

are trying to reach the more fundamental rights dealing with torture and cruel and inhuman treatment.

As much as I would wish we could do what the gentleman from Iowa wants to do, it is simply not within our reach to make it effective. It would mean we would end up with a provision which is unenforceable, of no real meaning and, therefore, it would not contribute to the advancement of human rights that, I think, all of us in this Chamber would like to see.

Let me add that I have just spent the last 2 hours listening to the description of an American citizen of his last 17 days in a Brazilian torture center. This is a man who is a Methodist minister and who had been a stringer for Time magazine and for the Associated Press. He talked about such horrors as the electric shocks that were administered to parts of his body.

Mr. Chairman, it is this kind of conduct that we seek to reach, I think that with the language we have in the committee bill, which is very carefully worked out and very carefully fashioned so that it could be effective, will begin to put our weight on the side of decency. But if we overreach, then the whole thing will fall to the ground and we will make no advance at all.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge in the interest of human rights that we reject this amendment, despite the fact that on the face of it, it might appear to be attractive.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman speaks of torture in the terms of the use of weapons and torture devices of one kind or another. Torture may take various forms, as the gentleman well knows. What I am trying to reach is the denial of human rights under any circumstances.

Russia has had 50 years in which to allow its people human rights.

What business have we dealing with that government until it give its people fundamental human rights?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is right in raising the issue with respect to the Soviet Union. I am distressed at the violation of human rights that occurs in the Soviet Union. I think anybody who loves justice and has a sense of decency ought to condemn these Soviet practices. The Soviet Union is not, however, a beneficiary of this bill.

We have not yet come to the time when we are furnishing foreign assistance to the Soviet Union. Our relations are more of a commercial nature, and it is not a matter that is within the compass of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(On request of Mr. GROSS and by unanimous consent, Mr. FRASER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GROSS. What the gentleman is saying, in effect, is what the mother told her daughters who wanted to go swimming:

Hang your clothes on a hickory limb, but don't go near the water.

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman is always filled with profound wisdom. I have always admired him for it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do hope that we will reject this amendment.

We have language, as the gentleman from Minnesota has pointed out, in the committee bill dealing with gross violations of human rights. If we should attempt to impose this kind of a burden on the President, subject also to a review by Congress, before aid could be given to any country, we would surely be developing a nightmare kind of bureaucracy.

I think the main point that the gentleman from Iowa is making is that we perhaps should hesitate to pass judgment on conditions in other countries; and if we do, we should pass judgment on all countries.

There is some plausibility, perhaps, to that approach, but I think very little would be proved by accepting this language. I am quite sure that not a single potential recipient would change its course one iota if an unsatisfactory performance by that country were found by the President.

I would suppose that the point of this amendment also is that it is not easy for any language in this field to result in a prohibition of aid to a country. At the same time, it does seem to me that it is appropriate for us to point out that gross violations are something that deeply concern us and should be an instance for cutting off aid.

Therefore, I hope we will not accept this blanket attempt to indicate that we think all potential recipients are violating the human rights of their citizens.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLODY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I note in the committee bill, as reported, there is a sense-of-the-Congress expression with respect to the observance of human rights and the sense of the Congress that we would not want to have internationally recognized human rights violated.

On the other hand, the amendment, it seems to me, would impose an impossible task on the President to determine some internal actions or internal standards in another country which would be completely unfair and unworkable insofar as the application of this legislation is concerned. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I agree with the gentleman. I think it would be a very unwise step for us to take, and I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is not that obligation found in the committee bill?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No. I might say that if the gentleman will reread the language in the committee bill, there

must be a gross violation of human rights, and we spell out what kinds of violations of human rights we are talking about.

We could get into an argument about what particular performance with respect to human rights, as such, would be necessary under the language of your amendment. But I would suggest that gross violations of human rights such as torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment are specific enough to exclude most potential recipients automatically from consideration for aid because hopefully few countries engage in such violations.

Mr. GROSS. Whether gross or ungross violations of human rights, does the gentleman condone or support the violation of human rights?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No. I understand what the gentleman from Iowa is referring to.

Mr. GROSS. It is not a question of interfering. If they want our money and our assistance, they can provide for the human rights of their citizens. That is all they have to do.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say that it is easy to take a holier-than-thou attitude. All I am saying is that the bill sets forth the kinds of violations of human rights involved, such as torture and inhuman treatment. We should not set ourselves up as judges of the internal conditions of all countries in order to determine whether they should get our assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) in urging that this amendment be defeated. Does not the gentleman from New Jersey agree that the delegation of this kind of power to the President of the United States is really not wise under the circumstances? The amendment would place an intolerable burden on the President to make these determinations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I certainly agree with the gentleman. Certainly with respect to a country's consideration of the human rights of its own citizens, this would be a difficult test. How would the President of the United States make such a determination?

Mr. FASCELL. Furthermore, I point out that the committee has made determinations in this bill both in a policy statement and by specific action on money amounts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in conjunction with my own Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, has held a long series of hearings with respect to the problem of human rights violations. Not only as a

December 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11599

broad and general concept, but also as it may apply to the foreign policy of the United States; effective enforcement in the United Nations; the Organization of American States, and other regional agencies. The report of the Fraser subcommittee on human rights, supported by the full committee, is truly a monumental document as a blueprint for foreign policy considerations of the United States. So the Foreign Affairs Committee has interested itself very deeply in the whole question of human rights, both as to the general principles of human rights, and also as to the fundamental application of U.S. foreign policy.

More than that the committee, as a result of long hearings, has actually and specifically indicated its concern to conditions reviewed and discussed in its hearings by action in this bill.

I happen to think that this is a far better way, a proper way and a more purposeful way to do what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) has stated which is—to apply foreign policy considerations of the United States to the question of human rights, by specific action as has been done in this bill, rather than to present a broad and indefinite criteria on human rights that would be impossible in application, and would place an intolerable burden on the President of the United States.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the dialog as presented by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) and in some areas I agree with them. The only thing I find difficult to understand is whether or not the Committee on Foreign Affairs is going to apply the same standard of not looking into a country's internal affairs, as my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, has said, with respect to South Africa and Rhodesia, or do we treat those a little differently? When the gentleman from New Jersey spoke I wondered whether that same reasoning could also apply to the case of Rhodesia and South Africa.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, we have tried to look into all aspects of this situation in a number of different countries. We had witnesses come before our subcommittee who testified about the problem in the Soviet Union, and we invited Mr. Solzhenitsyn to appear. We looked into the difficulty of people following their own religious beliefs in the U.S.S.R. We have also looked at a number of other countries which are under authoritarian regimes both of the left and the right. The problem of what to do about human rights as far as the U.S. policy is concerned is where it gets to be a tougher problem. We have tried to do this by an expression of the sense of the Congress, directed especially to gross and persistent violations of human rights. But it is not an easy question to

resolve in relation to our country's other foreign policy interests.

And that is also the difficulty that we find with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

If I could continue with my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, it would seem, however, that in our foreign policy we are in the curious position of being asked to extend the most favored nation clause treaty to the Soviet Union while curtailing trade with Rhodesia. I assume in response to what the gentleman said, that we probably could read the Gulag Archipelago into the record if we want to. I do not think we have to go into quite that detailed a hearing to know what is going on in the Soviet Union.

We are going in one direction when it relates to Communism. Yet when it relates to Rhodesia and South Africa, I understand there is a general feeling around the Foreign Affairs Committee that we should take the Byrd Amendment off the books and treat them harshly because of internal affairs. I think it strikes many of us that it is not giving even-handed treatment.

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman will yield, I am not advocating any trade restrictions on South Africa causing an interruption of normal commercial relationships. The case of Rhodesia has been the subject of international action at the request of the British Government. I think the Rhodesian problem is on a different footing.

In the case of South Africa, it would be a bilateral decision, and I think one needs to be a little wary of a bilateral decision when interrupting normal trade relations or diplomatic relations with a country.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I agree that the case of Solzhenitsyn is individual, and South Africa is a government; but I think we are ending up with different standards for what many of us think are not necessarily valid reasons.

Mr. FRASER. May I say to the gentleman that to the extent that we seem to be inconsistent, I think we need to try to narrow those inconsistencies as we move ahead. I think the United States ought to stand rather firmly on the defense of human rights around the world. It is true that as we shape our foreign policy, consistency seems to give way to other considerations. In general I think we would be better off if we would adhere to that position as strongly as possible, as a matter of our own self respect in the world community of nations.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I agree. It is a general policy which is good, but which is also hard to implement.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You are merely sparring around over this business of applying meaningful legislation to the conditions under which

foreign aid is dished out around the world. The gentleman from Minnesota wants to pick one country, and the sponsors of this amendment want to hand pick the countries to which they would deny foreign aid. What I am trying to do is deal even-handedly around the world in the matter of human rights. Let us stop this shilly-shallying and putting off until tomorrow what we ought to do today, or drop the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROSENTHAL

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROSENTHAL: Page 18, strike out lines 5 and 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "in compliance with the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Foreign Military Sales Act, and any agreement entered into under such Acts, and that substantial progress toward agreement has been made regarding military forces in Cyprus."

(Mr. ROSENTHAL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer will simply bring the Foreign Assistance Act into conformity with existing legislation. That legislation, Public Law 93-448, was the continuing resolution which the Congress passed on October 17 and which the President signed the next day into law.

During September and October the House voted seven times on the matter we now discuss—the legality and the wisdom of our military assistance to Turkey. It is not, therefore, necessary to review all of the arguments. Rather, I will try to bring the situation up to date from October both on Cyprus and legislatively:

First, on Cyprus, the stalemate continues. While the humanitarian talks between Turkish and Greek Cypriot leaders did produce some POW exchanges, the essential problems of military occupation by 40,000 Turkish troops, and the consequent displacement of over 200,000 Cypriot citizens remain and intensify. Many thousands of refugees are living in tents; other thousands occupy public building and thereby disrupt the educational and administrative structure of the island republic.

No negotiations have begun on the principal issues of the future government of the island, of the refugees' status nor of the military occupation. For while Greece has undergone successful elections since October, the Turkish Government is still disrupted by the Cyprus military victory of its armies. No political leader is prepared to see another gain from the events on Cyprus.

The return of President Makarios to Cyprus last week will have important effects on the island and its future.

H 11600

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 11, 1974

Without predicting how his return will affect specific negotiating points, it is clear that Makarios will strengthen the determination of the Greek Cypriots and of mainland Greeks, and their government, that a military occupation of the island by Turkey cannot be the basis of those negotiations.

The Caramanlis government in Athens, armed with a 54-percent victory at the polls in November, is ready to negotiate provided, and this is a vital proviso, that free negotiations are possible without the duress which the present Turkish military occupation imposes on the island.

The legislative actions since October fit into these events as follows: The Congress imposed, in the continuing resolution of October, the suspension of military aid to Turkey because that aid was illegal and because it was preventing, in the congressional judgment, the commencement of negotiations.

The administration insisted that it could achieve the start of negotiations only if aid were not suspended. In this legislative stalemate, a compromise was reached. Aid would be suspended on December 10, giving the administration 55 extra days to get negotiations started. It had already had nearly 3 months between the Turkish invasion in July and the congressional action in October. In a compromise among fair-minded people, one expects both sides to carry out the bargain. The Congress did not seek to shorten the 55-day period given to the administration for an extra-legal attempt to induce negotiations; neither should the administration seek an extension of that 55-day period for continued illegal aid to Turkey.

Unfortunately, this is exactly what the administration wants. It proposed to me and it proposed in the other body an extension of 2 months so that aid would not be suspended. The Senate unfortunately accepted the plea that an extension was appropriate because there was not government in Turkey available to negotiate. This is exactly like the plea for mercy made by an orphan who has just killed both of his parents. There is no government in Turkey because of the Cyprus invasion and occupation. When that military action is seen as a mistake by the Turks and not as a victory, we will have progress on Cyprus negotiations.

Yesterday, December 10, the suspension of military aid to Turkey went into effect. The State Department announced this fact at its noon briefing yesterday. The question today is whether that aid should be resumed illegally prior to the reasonable conditions set last October in the continuing resolution which the President signed. Those conditions were:

First, that the Government of Turkey be in compliance with the Foreign Assistance Act, the Foreign Military Sales Act, and the agreement specifically signed under those acts; and

Second, that substantial progress be made regarding an agreement on military forces on Cyprus.

My amendment today puts those two conditions into the Foreign Assistance Act exactly as they were put into the continuing resolution in October.

I urge adoption of this amendment which will confirm the congressional intent of insuring that our aid program not be used for purposes of military aggression or for continuing the aid to a country which wants to use U.S.-supplied equipment to intimidate an essentially defenseless country in order to continue indefinitely its occupation of one-third of that country.

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of State is in Brussels today discussing, as I understand it, with the Prime Minister of Greece and the Prime Minister of Turkey about the situation on Cyprus. If we should approve this amendment, this would only make more difficult the Secretary's efforts to facilitate a settlement.

We are continuing our efforts to get wider negotiations underway, but the Secretary needs more time. I think the language of the committee bill is sufficient, and this amendment should be defeated.

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rosenthal amendment to write into permanent law the cutoff of U.S. military aid and sales to Turkey until such time as the President certifies that Turkey is in compliance with the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Foreign Military Sales Act and until the President certifies that substantial progress toward agreement has been made regarding military forces in Cyprus.

The Rosenthal language amends the section in the Committee bill that would suspend aid to Turkey until the President certifies only that the Government of Turkey is making a substantial good-faith effort to achieve a negotiated settlement with respect to Cyprus.

Mr. Chairman, the Rosenthal amendment differs from a provision in the Senate-passed bill which would delay the suspension of aid to Turkey until 30 days after the 94th Congress convenes.

Mr. Chairman, we are all aware, I am sure, that last July and August Turkey invaded the tiny island of Cyprus. Because the Turkish Government conducted this assault with American-supplied tanks, planes, ammunition, and other implements of war, the Turkish Government asked those provisions of the Americans—in direct violation of the law—the Foreign Assistance Act and the Foreign Military Sales Act—which make clear that weapons supplied to foreign countries by the taxpayers of the United States are to be used for defensive purposes only and not for aggressive purposes.

The laws of which I speak make clear that any nation that receives American military services or equipment becomes immediately ineligible for such assistance if it is utilized for aggressive purposes.

But in the face of the clear use of American military aid for aggressive purposes and the clear violations of U.S. law and of the agreements of Turkey with the United States, our Government refused to suspend aid to Turkey.

Mr. Chairman, on October 18, 1974, after Congress had voted several times for an immediate cutoff in military aid to Turkey, the President signed into law the continuing resolution which included a provision to delay the suspension of aid to Turkey until December 10. That postponement had been requested by the administration to give Secretary Kissinger additional time to conclude a settlement in Cyprus. It was argued that negotiations were underway and that just a few more months were necessary to complete them.

But, Mr. Chairman, instead of evidence from the Department of State of meaningful progress in the Cyprus negotiations, the State Department is now asking for additional time.

Mr. Chairman, Turkish forces still occupy almost 40 percent of Cyprus. Turkey continues to refuse to withdraw its 40,000 troops after nearly 5 months of occupation on the island. Over 200,000 Greek-Cypriot refugees are still unable to return to their homes in the territory occupied by the Turkish forces. In fact, since October, Turkish forces have become even more deeply entrenched and Turkey has indicated that it has no intention of giving up the territory it gained during its invasion last summer.

Mr. Chairman, although there has been no apparent progress in negotiations and although Turkey remains fixed in its position, almost 5 months after the invasion, the administration is now asking for a further extension of the deadline. But, Mr. Chairman, a further extension cannot be justified:

First. No progress has been made during the past 55 days and there is little evidence to suggest that any further extension would be any more productive.

Second. No meaningful negotiations can begin until Turkey agrees to major concessions. Only the immediate pressure of a cutoff of military aid can now produce these concessions.

Third. Lack of a stable government in Turkey makes a settlement in the near future highly unlikely.

Fourth. We can no longer permit the United States to underwrite the occupation of Cyprus and we can no longer ignore United States law which makes it illegal to extend military assistance to any country which uses such aid for aggressive purposes.

Fifth. Failures to approve this amendment would only encourage Turkish forces to become still more entrenched on Cyprus and still more adamantly opposed to serious negotiations.

The administration has argued that a further extension of the deadline is crucial to our security interests in the Eastern Mediterranean. Although the administration seems to acknowledge that continuing aid to Turkey is illegal, it justifies that aid by citing overriding national security interests.

Linwood Holton, Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, in a November 22, 1974, letter to me that I can only describe as astonishing, asserted:

After carefully weighing the legal and foreign policy considerations, the Administration decided that it was impossible publicly to express a legal conclusion on the issues

December 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

of Turkey's eligibility for further assistance and sales without undermining our foreign policy objectives.

Mr. Chairman, the strength of NATO and our security interests in the Eastern Mediterranean are also threatened by the continuing dispute in Cyprus. And, clearly, the continuation of U.S. aid to Turkey during the past 5 months has not produced a settlement there.

Further, our security in that part of the world depends upon a strong relationship with Greece. But that relationship is being undermined by the administration's continued support of illegal aid to Turkey.

Most significantly, however, the request for an extension of the deadline ignores the fundamental issue that continuing military aid to Turkey is in violation of U.S. law.

An editorial on Sunday, December 8, 1974, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, observed:

ARMS FOR TURKEY

When the United States Senate threatened in October to cut military aid to Turkey, the White House pleaded for more time and eventually managed to win two compromises. The termination date was postponed until Dec. 10 and President Ford was authorized to continue military assistance after that date provided he found "substantial progress" and been made on the Cyprus issue. Not only has there been no progress, but it does not seem to be forthcoming. Turkey remains as adamant as ever about the maintenance of its occupation force in Cyprus.

Incredibly, the Senate voted Thursday in favor of yet another extension of the deadline, to Feb. 15. The extension, if sustained by the House, would mean that Congress has failed on significant questions of principle and policy. The laws of this country stipulate that military assistance can be used by the recipient only for purposes of national defense. If there is a violation, as there certainly was in the instance of Turkey's invasion of a foreign country, then the White House should be bound to uphold the law and, at the very least, terminate military assistance. Secretary of State Kissinger has all but acknowledged that the law was violated yet he continues to insist that the principle of upholding the law should be overlooked in the national interest.

As for the question of policy, there is no virtue in rewarding an aggressor and in seeing the other ally in this conflict—Greece—driven further away from the Western alliance. It has now been confirmed not only that U.S. military aid to Turkey continued after the invasion of Cyprus, but also that it increased sharply. Missouri's two senators voted wisely to reject extension of the deadline on the assumption that if the Senate backed down again, the government of Turkey would no longer pay serious attention to warnings from Capitol Hill. If the House fails to eliminate the extension amendment from the foreign aid bill, then it too will have played the sorry role of actually postponing a solution to the conflict on Cyprus.

Mr. Chairman, officials of the Department of State today announced that the provisions of the continuing resolution will be fully and completely implemented and that military aid to Turkey will be suspended. They have also indicated that all military supplies now en route to Turkey will be returned to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we must now write into permanent law this aid cutoff provision

and I urge my colleagues to support the Rosenthal amendment.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in the few brief remarks I made on this bill yesterday in general debate, I took occasion to say that I took the time to make any remarks at all because I felt that this was an exceedingly important issue with which we were presented and that it was one of those times when we ought to use politics in the sense of statecraft and not in the sense of counting noses in the precincts.

My objection to this amendment here is that I think it is not statecraft. It is counting noses in the precincts.

I have a lot of good, Greek friends in my precincts and they are almost all friends and supporters of mine and they are American citizens. They think of themselves in that way, as they should and as they do. I do not believe if they were considering this amendment, and the facts were before them, that they would be for it. I think they would be against it, because constitutionally the President and the Secretary of State need to be able to use foreign aid in the one legitimate way they can use foreign aid, and that is as a specific tool of American foreign policy to bring about some specific advantage to this Nation.

Now, it is to our Nation's advantage to get peace in Cyprus, because we need peace in the whole Middle East area and as to these two countries, we have no choice between them.

Greece and Turkey are both allies of ours. What we need is peace between them. The Turks, particularly, are holding down the right end of the line against the Russians, and they are one of the few peoples who have shown by the record that they are willing to fight the Russians if necessary. They even went to Korea and fought there because they felt that strongly about it.

The President and the Secretary of State think—and they must have good reason—that they can work this thing out better if the 435 Members of this House, for parochial reasons or any other reasons, do not try to tie their hands. The Members of the other body think that also. I think we ought to give the benefit of the doubt to them.

It is said that this is illegal because the law says that arms we supply should be used only for defensive purposes. Is it defensive when the Israelis raid the neutral country of Lebanon and kill women and children in their villages, which they do with our arms? Well, strategically it very likely is defensive, because they are protecting themselves against terrorism from the Palestinian guerrillas, but tactically it is offensive. We say nothing about it, and I do not say that we should.

But, here in this situation, the particular problem started because a right-wing dictatorship in Greece overthrew the regime in Cyprus, hoping to take over the country, and the Turks moved in troops. Technically, tactically, that is offensive just like the raids into Lebanon, but I suppose from the Turkish point of

view, it is defensive; they are protecting their Cypriot minority.

So, why do we have to get so worked up about it in this instance when we do not in others? In others, we give the President and the Secretary of State some leeway and some discretion to perform their constitutional functions in the way they feel is best for this country. I do not see why we do not do it here.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend that we vote this amendment down and give them a reasonable chance to do just exactly that.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment.

(Mr. SARBANES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I think that we are indeed confronted here today with the critical question of whether we are going to practice statecraft in its highest understanding. We have before us the Foreign Assistance Act, which, of course, poses for each of us the fundamental issue: Why foreign aid? What is its purpose? Why are we engaged in such programs?

The law already on the books is very clear on this issue with respect to the providing of defense articles and defense services. That law says—that is existing law, already placed on our statute books by a Congress and signed by a President:

Defense articles and defense services to any country shall be furnished solely for internal security, for legitimate self-defense, to permit the recipient country to participate in regional or collective arrangements or measures consistent with the Charter of the United Nations, or otherwise to permit the recipient country to participate in collective measures requested by the United Nations for the purpose of maintaining or restoring international peace and security. . . .

Clearly, Turkey has used American supplied military equipment in contravention of the above statutory provisions. To my knowledge, no one seriously contends that the Government of Turkey has not violated that law. Such violation was conceded by Members of the Congress who, during our prior consideration of this matter, were seeking to continue aid to Turkey. The State Department has been unwilling to come forward with a legal opinion addressed to this particular question, and it is fairly clear that the reason for this reluctance is because it could not give a legal opinion which would find that the law had not been violated.

We have been up and down this hill, as all the Members well know, many times before. Today we have the opportunity to make it clear in the permanent legislation that this House intends for American foreign policy to have legal and moral content. It is time for the Congress to draw the line and to say that the law must be obeyed. Existing law requires that nations violating its terms are to become immediately ineligible for foreign assistance.

That requirement for immediate termination of aid was compromised in mid-October and the application of the law was suspended for a period of time,

H 11602

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 11, 1974

that is, until the 10th of December. That date has now come and passed, and I believe it is clearly time to invoke the provisions of the legislation which would require, in order for aid to continue, that Turkey be in compliance with the law and that substantial progress be made toward an agreement.

Let us look, for a moment, at what is happening on Cyprus so that we might better judge the assertion that further delay in the cut off of aid will contribute to a resolution of that situation. Turkish action in Cyprus now indicates a plan and a design to incorporate under Turkish control the 40 percent of the island which Turkish armed forces overran through aggressive military action last summer. They have taken over homes and businesses; they have issued stamps; they have set up a separate administrative apparatus; they are requiring the reregistration of automobiles. Everything is being done, in effect, to create the de facto partition of the island of Cyprus. They are becoming more and more entrenched in the domination of an area gained through brutal aggression, an area which represents 40 percent of the geography of Cyprus and 75 percent of its economy.

If the Congress is not to carry through on its previously adopted requirement that our law be complied with or that aid be suspended, why should Turkey pay any attention to the position adopted by the legislative branch of our Government? Why should any other country pay attention to the requirements of our existing law with respect to the use of the assistance that is being provided such countries? Why should they not draw the lesson that they can ignore the restrictions upon the use of that assistance and embark upon an aggressive enterprise designed to achieve their objectives by force.

I believe that it is long past time for the United States to stop supplying armaments to Turkey—a country which has engaged in shocking aggression upon the Island of Cyprus. The integrity and the independence of that small republic are at issue. American armaments and military supplies, paid for by American taxpayers, have been used, contrary to our law and contrary to any international principles of justice, to subvert the freedom of that independent republic and to bring death and destruction to that tragic island.

I urge the House to adopt the Rosenthal amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have read the paper and I understand what the procedure is supposed to be. We are not supposed to fight this amendment in the House; we are supposed to let it go over to the conference and then hope that the Senate position will prevail over there because the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, formerly the Vice President of the United States, took the lead in the Senate in taking a responsible and statesmanlike position; but we are not supposed to put anybody on the spot here in the House.

But I do not think that is quite the way we ought to handle foreign policy matters in this body. I think we ought to discuss this issue, and I feel strongly it would be a serious mistake to just allow this amendment to go through on the assumption that it is a bad amendment but HUBERT HUMPHREY will take the rap for getting it out in conference.

I supported the cutoff aid to Turkey. I also supported the effort that we made here, before we adjourned, to get a delay, a delay we finally did get until the 10th of December.

A lot has happened since we passed that delay. In the first place, there has been an election in Greece and a moderate leader, Mr. Caramanlis, has been elected overwhelmingly. The monarchy has also been rejected, and it looks as though some of the extreme anti-American attitudes that characterized some of those people over there, Mr. Papandreu, for example, Miss Mercouri, and others, are not going to be controlling policy. The outlook looks good for an intelligent, reasonable approach on the part of the Greek Government toward a settlement in Cyprus.

In addition, Archbishop Makarios has returned to Cyprus and has addressed a mass rally. That does not seem to have created any turmoil over there either. Yes, the deadline has come and it has passed, and we have not accomplished anything. Why not? Why has Secretary Kissinger not brought the parties together? Simply because they are still without a functioning government in Turkey. It is just that simple.

How can Mr. Kissinger get anybody to agree if one party does not even have a government?

So does it not make sense for us to give the Secretary of State at least a little time in the hope that maybe a government will finally be agreed on in Turkey? How can we get anybody out of Cyprus if there is no government to enter into meaningful negotiations.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought, at the very least, to give the President and the Secretary of State enough time. I think we ought to give them the time they have asked for. We ought to give them the time that HUBERT HUMPHREY, a great liberal and one who supports all these causes, has asked for.

Certainly it is not for the purpose of oppression or the violation of law that Senator HUMPHREY has done this. But he has recognized there is a higher consideration in this case and so he has taken the lead in the Senate and said, "Of course, let us be sensible enough to give the President of the United States some more time in the hope that we will soon get a new Turkish government that can agree to a reasonable and a fair settlement on Cyprus, and the withdrawal of Turkish troops from Cyprus."

By the time the new Congress is sworn in maybe they will have agreed to a new government. If not, if Turkey can't resolve its parliamentary crisis in a couple of months, then perhaps the whole effort will be hopeless. But will that really facilitate a satisfactory solution?

Is the situation in NATO not bad enough already, when the British Government is taking \$11 billion out of their

defense? When Portugal may already be in the hands of the Communists, with the undoubted result that the Azores will not be available to us if there should be another flareup in the Middle East.

With all of these troubles, do we now want to knock both Greece and Turkey out of the NATO too and let the whole alliance blow up? That is what might well happen.

Let us not allow all the statesmanship to reside in the other body. Let us show Senator HUMPHREY that he has some troops over in this Chamber, and let us not force him to take the lead in this effort all alone.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, why should we supply weapons to a country that does not even have a government? I support the amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. This is only a caretaker regime, as the gentleman knows. It has no parliamentary backing to negotiate settlement terms on Cyprus.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL).

I supported the position of the gentleman from New York on a number of occasions. On the other hand, I am convinced now that in order for us to be useful in helping to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the very difficult Cyprus problem, it is necessary to adopt and follow the committee language and not the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I am anxious to see a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. I hold no brief for the Turks—nor should it be concluded that the Greeks are entirely blameless. The invasion and occupation of Cyprus by the Turks was wrong. A solution of the perplexing Cyprus problem must be found. Our Nation can be useful in helping to find such a peaceful solution—only if we avoid the implications of the Rosenthal amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has presented to us language which suspends aid to Turkey unless/and until the President determines and certifies to the Congress that the government of Turkey is making a substantial good faith effort to achieve a negotiated settlement with respect to Cyprus.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion that language will enable the President to continue the good offices of our Nation to bring about a permanent and peaceful settlement of the difficult Cyprus problem. Accordingly, I hope that the Rosenthal amendment will be voted down.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the existing language in the bill is in the best interests of Greece itself—and both the Greek and Turkish Cypriots. Even more important—the committee language is in the best interests of the United States of America.

(Mr. McCLODY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

December 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11603

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I support the Rosenthal amendment, as I did when it passed on October 16, and as did 194 Members of this House.

I am not going to recite all of the facts leading to the passage of the amendment and all of the facts subsequent to that which have brought us to this point, except to say this: that when that amendment passed on October 16, as I recall the debate in the House, it was the President himself who agreed to it albeit grudgingly. It was taken up with him. It was the result of compromise and conference, and it was ultimately acceptable to this House, and it was passed overwhelmingly.

What is happening today, or at least what is intended to happen today by those who sought to subvert the original amendment is to engage in salami tactics. By that I mean if you cannot win on October 16, you give in, although you try to lessen the impact; when there is good faith on the other side, and you have lost you take the best they will give you and pass it. Then when the deadline comes, you come in and say, "Well, we want a new ball game. We want a new date. We do not want to abide by the amendment we agreed to on October 16."

Mr. Chairman, we do that on too many occasions in this House. We too often permit the will of the House to be subverted in some particular way by a different bill on a different occasion which is brought up under allegedly new circumstances, and yet the circumstances are really exactly the same. The circumstances on October 16 were exactly those that prevail today.

There are close to 200,000 Greek Cypriot refugees in camps and in tents. We do not see the Turks moving out of the 40 percent of Cyprus that they occupied by force, which is what we said they must do if we are to continue to give them aid.

What I am suggesting to the House is that if we go along with this proposition and extend the deadline, we are falling into the very trap that was probably set by the opponents of the amendment on October 16. And I am saying that if we do it today, we will do it tomorrow and the day after that.

If we believed in the morality that we expressed on October 16 by passage of the Rosenthal amendment, that same moral principle applies on December 11.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment which will continue the suspension of aid to Turkey until it is clearly demonstrated that Turkey is in complete compliance with the terms of the Foreign Assistance Act, and substantial progress is being made toward effecting a complete withdrawal of

Turkish forces from the besieged island of Cyprus.

There are many of us here today who have an urge to say "I told you so" to the majority of our colleagues who were so convinced that a postponement until December 10 of a decision to cut off aid to Turkey would result in a solution to the Cyprus crisis. Well, it is now December 11. There is no peace and the Secretary of State continues his nonproductive policy.

Despite a recent flurry of activity by the Secretary, in reality he is no closer to solving the Cyprus crisis than he was 5 months ago when Turkey first invaded Cyprus.

We cannot afford to lose sight of the fact that what we are dealing with is a clear legal issue. Turkey was—and will continue to be in violation of the Foreign Assistance Act—as long as she maintains occupation forces on the island. And it has clearly been this nation's failure to deal with this illegality which has perpetuated the suffering and misery of the Cypriot people.

We have had ample opportunity to cut off this aid. No less than four votes have been cast on this issue, and on each occasion I have maintained the position that an immediate and total cut off of aid was imperative to solving the Cyprus crisis. I firmly believe this and I hope that more of you will join me in this belief by supporting this amendment today.

Thus far in this bill we have addressed ourselves more than adequately to the plight of other nations in the world where the basic rights of their citizens are in jeopardy. Yet unless we pass this amendment today, we will be failing to respond to the critical and tragic situation in Cyprus. We cannot ignore the fact that almost 40 percent of this nation is occupied by a hostile foreign power, which is using our military aid illegally to maintain their control. We cannot ignore the fact that this 5-month crisis has resulted in the deaths of more than 4,000 Cypriots and has caused a \$1 billion loss to the Cyprus economy.

What we must do is respond by cutting off the military aid, the single biggest item which has allowed the Turkish nation to control the nation and people of Cyprus against their will.

The contention of this administration throughout the crisis and even up until the present has been that a cutoff of aid to Turkey would seriously jeopardize the prospects for peace on Cyprus. Yet despite an agreement between the Congress and the administration giving the administration 60 days to work out an agreement on Cyprus, no substantive progress toward this goal has been recorded. It is therefore time for all of us to realize that a total and immediate cutoff of aid to Turkey is the only vehicle this Nation has left which will convince Turkey to release their stranglehold on Cyprus and allow the quarter of a million refugees to return to their homes and loved ones.

The time for words and unfulfilled promises is over. It is time for this Congress to act with decisiveness. There can be no more compromise. Compromise in the past has only translated into concession.

Allowing this situation to go unresolved for as long as it has has represented the ultimate compromise in the eyes of millions of loyal Greek Americans who view our clearly "Turkey tilting" policies with understandable bitterness.

We owe nothing to Turkey. Over the years they have demonstrated their total unreliability as an ally. While Greece has been a steadfast and loyal ally, and her community in America has contributed much to the well-being of our Nation. We owe it to them to put an end to the killing of their brethren in Cyprus and allow them to live in peace.

We are once again being asked to cast a vote which could have historic implications. A vote for this amendment will indicate to Turkey that her aggressions against the people of Cyprus must cease immediately. It will demonstrate to our friends and foes alike that this Nation will not tolerate military conquests of any nature. We must also show to the American people that we as the lawmakers of this Nation expect full adherence to our laws by all whom they affect. But most importantly let this vote serve to show the Cypriot people that their future security and well-being is our immediate concern.

Anything less than this amendment is totally unacceptable. We must firmly oppose any further extensions of a cutoff date. The dismal record of this administration with respect to solving the Cyprus crisis speaks for itself. Their time is up—and we must tell them so today.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Ms. ABZUG).

(Ms. ABZUG asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment to cut off military aid to Turkey until we are assured that real progress is being made in solving the Cyprus tragedy, and that Turkey is in compliance with the Foreign Aid and Foreign Military Sales Acts.

There is no excuse for continuing to break our own laws by allowing Turkey to use U.S. military supplies to maintain their take-over of Cyprus. A Library of Congress analysis states that the cutoff of aid—

is not discretionary as a matter of policy, but is mandatory under the terms of the Foreign Assistance Act.

About 180,000 Greek Cypriots were displaced by Turkish forces who now occupy 40 percent of Cyprus. Thousands are still living in cold tents or shacks. Another 20,000 Turkish Cypriots live in refugee camps in the occupied area. The human suffering is incalculable.

Yet it seems that little pressure is being exerted by the United States for a prompt settlement. The best form of pressure we can exert—and must exert under our own laws—is to withhold further aid. The administration, on the contrary, wants to increase it.

The State Department, in reply to Senator KENNEDY's charge, has admitted that U.S. arms shipments to Turkey

have increased since the invasion. The Department claims this is within the law because it "further negotiations for a peaceful settlement" but that is a very curious interpretation.

Further, Secretary Kissinger's correspondence with Senator KENNEDY gives little reassurance that the deadlock will be broken, nor the refugees returned to their homes.

Under these conditions, it is the clear duty of this body to clarify our intent with a firm declaration that aid is being cut off until Turkey fulfills its obligations.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take but a moment or two. We have considered this matter several times—three times in October, and finally, as has been said here, a compromise was reached suspending the aid cut-off until December 10. The administration has strongly urged that we give them more time to try to work out the Cyprus issue.

Since we adopted the December 10 date, many things have happened in that region. There is a crisis in the government in Turkey, as has been mentioned by the gentleman from New York. In Greece, the Greeks have voted to end the monarchy, and the Greek Parliament is meeting for the first time this week. The organs of government have just now been formed, and they are really in no condition to negotiate right at this minute.

As the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) has pointed out, Archbishop Makarios has just returned to Cyprus. According to this morning's paper, it will take him 2 weeks to review the situation before any serious talks can begin.

With all of this said, I think that further debate on this is unnecessary. I hope the House will work its will. I assure the Members that I will take whatever product they come up with to conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL).

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 297, yeas 98, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 670]

AYES—297

Abdnor
Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Archer
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Bafalis
Baker
Bauman
Bennett
Bergland
Biaggi
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowen
Brademas
Breaux
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burgener
Burke, Calif.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Byron
Carney, Ohio
Casey, Tex.
Chisholm

Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Clay
Cleveland
Cochran
Collins, Ill.
Collins, Tex.
Conlan
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Crane
Cronin
Culver
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Daniels
Dominick V.
Danielson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellums
Denholm
Dent
Derwinski
Diags
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Drinan
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fascell
Fish
Flood
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frenzel
Frey
Fulton
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys
Gibbons
Gliman
Ginn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Pa.
Grover
Gude
Gunter
Guyer
Haley
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Harrington
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinschaw
Holt
Holtzman
Horton
Huber
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
King
Kluczyński
Koch
Kyros
Lagomarsino
Landgrebe
Landrum
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lujan
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McKay
McKinney
McSpadden
Macdonald
Madden
Maraziti
Martin, N.C.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Metcalfe
Mezvisky
Milford
Miller
Minish
Mink
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Moakley
Mollohan
Moorhead, Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Obey
O'Brien
O'Neill
Owens
Parris
Pattman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Price, Ill.
Pritchard
Rallsback
Randall
Rangel
Rarick
Rees
Regula
Reid
Reuss
Riefle
Rinaldo
Robinson, Va.
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Ronalco, Wyo.
Rooney, Pa.
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Roybal
Runnels
St Germain
Sandman
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Satterfield
Scherle
Schroeder
Seiberling
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Spence
Staggers
Stanton, James V.
Stark
Steele
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stokes
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Studds
Sullivan
Symington
Talcott
Taylor, N.C.
Teague
Thompson, N.J.
Thornton
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walsh
Wampler
Whalen
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wildnall
Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Wolf
Wright
Wylder
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Young, S.C.
Young, Tex.

NOES—98

Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Beard
Bell
Blester
Bray
Broomfield
Buchanan
Burlison, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Butler
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Cohen
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Dennis
Devine
Dickinson
Dorn
Erlenborn
Findley
Frelinghuysen
Froehlich
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Hamilton
Hanna
Hanrahan
Hansen, Idaho
Harsha
Hastings
Hays
Hogan
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Ichord
Johnson, Pa.
Ketchum
Latta
Lott
McClory
McCloskey
McFall
Madigan
Mahon
Mallory
Martin, Nebr.
Mazzoli
Michel
Minshall, Ohio

Montgomery
Morgan
Nelsen
Nichols
Pettis
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Preyer
Price, Tex.
Quile
Quillen
Rhodes
Roberts
Robison, N.Y.
Ruppe
Ruth
Ryan
Schneebeli
Sebelius
Shoup
Shriver
Shuster
Sikes
Skubitz
Stanton, J. William
Steed
Stratton
Symms
Taylor, Mo.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Treen
Veysey
Ware
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Winn
Wyatt
Young, Fla.
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NOT VOTING—39

Armstrong
Barrett
Bevill
Brasco
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Camp
Carey, N.Y.
Chappell
Collier
Conable
Eshleman
Fisher
Gialmo
Goldwater
Grasso
Hansen, Wash.
Hebert
Helm
Hollifield
Howard
Johnson, Colo.
Jones, N.C.
Kuykendall
Littin
Luken
Mann
Mathias, Calif.
Mills
O'Hara
Passman
Podell
Ronalco, N.Y.
Rooney, N.Y.
Smith, N.Y.
Steiger, Wis.
Tiernan
Vander Jagt
Wyman

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BINGHAM

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BINGHAM: Page 14, after line 4, insert the following:

"(h) For each fiscal year, no funds authorized to be appropriated under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be obligated or expended for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization until the President certifies to the Congress that such Organization (1) has adopted policies which are fully consistent with its educational, scientific and cultural objectives, and (2) has taken concrete steps to correct its recent actions of a primarily political character."

Page 13, line 24, strike out "subsection" and insert "subsections" in lieu thereof.

Page 14, line 4, strike out the quotation marks.

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would provide that no funds under this act could be used to fund UNESCO so long as UNESCO continues with the type of outrageously political actions which it has recently been taking.

This amendment is similar to the one proposed by Senator CASE that was adopted in the Senate. It differs in that it is limited to this act, which is appropriate under House rules. The language of the amendment is, I think, somewhat perfected over the Senate version in that this amendment does not call for repeal of resolutions which may have no relevance today.

For some time, the member states of UNESCO have been adopting clearly political resolutions aimed at the State of Israel. Recently these resolutions and related actions reached a hitherto unknown peak of outrageousness. For example, one of the resolutions called upon the UNESCO director general to seek the cooperation of the PLO in extending educational programs on the West Bank of the Jordan, the territories occupied by Israel—if the Members can imagine anything more ridiculous than that.

The resolutions have also invited the director general to suspend aid to Israel under UNESCO until Israel complies with some highly political resolutions with regard to archeological activities in Jerusalem which UNESCO, for political reasons, has criticized.

Many Members have been to Jerusalem in recent years and have seen the extraordinary work being carried on there by Mayor Teddy Kollek and others in uncovering treasures, and they know that nothing is dearer to the hearts of Israelis than preserving the archeological finds and other historical and religious antiquities.

Some Members may be surprised that this amendment would come from me, because they know that I served for 3 years in the United Nations, and was for 1 year U.S. Representative on the Economic and Social Council, which has within its jurisdiction supervision over UNESCO. I do so, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, because I feel that if we do not take a firm stand now, the politicizing of international organizations such as UNESCO is going to continue and worsen until these organizations are destroyed, and that would be a tragedy.

My amendment is intended, in part, to help out a friend of ours which has suffered a humiliation, the State of Israel; even more importantly, my amendment is intended to try to save an organization which we helped found and which has great potential in the educational, cultural, and scientific fields, but which, unfortunately, is now on the brink of destroying its potential. If UNESCO would stick to educational, cultural, and scientific projects it would be doing well, but when it gets itself embroiled in politics, it does itself considerable harm.

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, first let me commend the gentleman for his statement and reaffirm to the Members of this House that Israel has upheld to a remarkable degree maintenance and rehabilitation of holy places, including open access thereto. Much has been done to restore historical and archeological sites. They have worked closely, as the gentleman has said, with UNESCO in upholding the principles of the UNESCO constitution so very dear to Israel's deep commitment to scholarship, excellence in education, and intellectual exchange.

Let me say, moreover, I think the fundamental point the gentleman is making is, very basically, the United Nations today stands in some jeopardy. We saw a similar period in the 1930's in the League of Nations. Quite frankly, what has the action of the 18th session of the UNESCO General Conference proved? The excluding of Israel from the original European groupings subject to a determination of the director general is in violation of UNESCO's own constitution, particularly article I.

Paragraph 1 of article I, for instance, states the purpose of UNESCO as contributing to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations

through education, science, and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language, or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations.

This action taken by the 18th session of UNESCO is, I think, violative not only of its own constitution, but of the U.N. Charter, as well, specifically of the preamble and articles I and II. If there is any concept that is paramount to the vitality and the integrity and the honesty of the United Nations, it is respect for all nations, "large and small," and avoidance of interference in internal affairs. It is very clear in paragraph 3 the UNESCO constitution that UNESCO is to deal solely with educational, scientific and cultural matters and not political matters. Specifically, article I, paragraph 3, states:

3. With a view to preserving the independence, integrity and fruitful diversity of the cultures and educational systems of the States Members of this Organisation, the Organisation is prohibited from intervening in matters which are essentially within their domestic jurisdiction.

Accordingly, I think this is an opportunity for this House and, indeed, our Government, speaking through this House, to say that this is a moral position and must be upheld. I am hopeful that the UNESCO Director General will deny implementation of the resolution. I would point out that although Israel contributed \$111,096 to UNESCO in 1974 and \$98,496 in 1973, for the 1973-74 biennial, Israel received only \$24,000. While Israel has been a leader in intellectual and cultural exchange, its monetary benefits from UNESCO have been minimal at best. The position we take here today is thus not an economic or financial one—it is purely a question of conscience.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BINGHAM was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, I will conclude with just one final thought, and that is that this House has an opportunity here, in supporting the Bingham amendment, to make clear, before it is too late, that we do stand back of the UNESCO constitution and the charter of the United Nations, that the dangers of politicizing efforts in the education and cultural areas are serious, and that if politics of a narrow and partisan kind are to be permitted and respected and condoned by the United States and by the United Nations, mankind will suffer.

If this amendment is supported, I hope that this warning will be heeded while there is yet time to restore the integrity to the U.N.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York. It is if anything a restrained amendment. Many of us have become increasingly

apprehensive for the way the United Nations has been used as a forum against the United States and its friends.

Mr. Chairman, I think warning contained in this amendment is necessary and salutary and could hopefully avert an eventual movement for the United States to get out of the United Nations altogether or to otherwise act to control its operations at some time in the future.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman on his point that the politicizing of an international organization such as UNESCO is very unwise. But is this amendment not an attempt to violate our own treaty obligations with respect to UNESCO, if we should withhold funds because we are offended by the action that has been taken in that body?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think we have no alternative but to do this. If it means that we have to pull out of the organization, I would hope that pullout will be only temporary and that the members of that body will recognize that if they want participation by the United States, they will have to get themselves straightened out.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to say that I had intended to offer an amendment to cut the funds of all voluntary agencies of the U.N. back to the amount that we had appropriated for this year. However, in a discussion with the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations, he agreed that there would be hearings held on our entire position within the United Nations.

I think that the time has long since passed for us to reexamine our position with the United Nations inasmuch as it seems to me the entire concept of the United Nations has been perverted from its original concept.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the United States can any longer stand by while we as a nation are pushed into a position of subservience to that of some of the independent states who have most recently joined the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations to confirm the fact that we will hold hearings reassessing our entire position in the United Nations.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman has made a very good point. I believe there is enough concern about the recent actions of various U.N. bodies that seem to fall outside the scope of their regular and legitimate responsibilities that it is essential to take a very careful look at what they are doing and what kind of remedial action we may want to take in relation to those improvident acts.

H 11606

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 11, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act offered by my good friend and distinguished colleague from New York (Mr. BINGHAM). The amendment seeks to withhold funds from the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization until the President can report to Congress that the funds will be used specifically for uses consistent with the objectives of UNESCO and that they will terminate their blatant political actions of recent weeks.

Several weeks ago the Nation and the world reacted with shock and horror over the decision of the United Nations General Assembly to allow the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in a U.N. debate on the establishment of a Palestine State. It was apparent then as it is now that the United Nations and her organizations despite the noble hopes of their founders are no longer objective forums for the pursuit of international peace and justice in the world.

As we consider our annual authorization for foreign assistance, we have been presented with numerous arguments about wasteful use of our tax dollars for foreign assistance.

As the chief financial supporter of the United Nations and its subsidiaries it is incumbent that we impose at least these minimum conditions before we dole out our large annual sum to the United Nations. In a recent letter to the President I called for him to withhold the U.S. 1975 contribution to the U.N. until her policies of the past several months are changed. I consider this amendment to be an important first step in this direction and I urge its support today.

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

(Mr. CONLAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Chairman, I gather from news accounts that Communist and Third World nations ignored or virtually scorned Ambassador John Scali's warning in the General Assembly last Friday that the United Nations is cutting its own throat with blatant political grandstanding and demagoguery.

I believe many Americans are now looking to the Congress to put some teeth into Ambassador Scali's remarks. And there is no better way than by withholding further contributions to UNESCO until that organization repeals resolutions designed to condemn and isolate member nations.

Ambassador Scali warned U.N. members last year that the world body was undermining its own credibility and base of support with one-sided, unrealistic resolutions. He noted on Friday that this headlong rush to hypocrisy and expedi-

ence has since not only continued, but accelerated.

The U.N. has acted callously and arbitrarily in violation of its own rules and charter by giving the blood-drenched terrorist Palestine Liberation Organization authority to participate in last month's Middle East debate, and by expelling South Africa's Ambassador. In addition, UNESCO has illegally decided to fund the PLO and to bar Israel from assistance or participation in the group.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have generously kept the U.N. alive by paying more than a third of all U.N. bills over the years. Americans have done this despite the refusal of most U.N. members to pay their own annual assessments, because we hoped the U.N. would be an instrument of international peace and reconciliation. Unfortunately, that is no longer the case.

As the world has now obviously noted, humanitarian and cultural U.N. organizations like UNESCO have been turned into tools of political reprisal, violating both the letter and spirit of the U.N. Charter. So long as the U.N. continues to flaunt its central principles of tolerance and harmony, it has ceased to have such a useful role in the world as to deserve our continued support and participation.

I wholeheartedly support the Bingham amendment, prohibiting further U.S. contributions to UNESCO until all resolutions not of an educational, scientific, or cultural character have been repealed. I urge all my colleagues to join in adopting this amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONLAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) in seeking to withhold funds for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization until such time as UNESCO corrects its political act of cutting off UNESCO funds to Israel. An act which was so offensive to the educational, scientific, and cultural community throughout the world.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this worthy amendment seeking to restore some responsible thinking in the U.N.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask the author of the amendment, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM), or some other Member, this question:

I like the sound of the language in the amendment, but I may be over-pragmatic. I would like to know if the gentleman can tell us this:

What nations would be affected by the gentleman's amendment as far as UNESCO's dealings in the world are concerned?

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will yield, I have made it clear in my re-

marks that this amendment is aimed at the situation as far as Israel is concerned. The recent events that are referred to in the amendment have to do with the State of Israel; and if other situations arise, then the administration should be guided accordingly.

The object of this amendment is to require that UNESCO stick to its purposes, which are educational, cultural, and scientific, and to stay away from political action. As my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) pointed out, in its own charter UNESCO is required to abstain from political action. The problem is that it is getting involved in politics.

Mr. FLOWERS. I certainly agree with that program for UNESCO and that program for the rest of the United Nations. My only hope would be that the gentleman who offered the amendment as well as the committee that has brought the bill before us would take a hard look into the overall participation by the United States in the United Nations, certainly with a view toward recent happenings at the United Nations.

I think that the people of the United States are demanding that we review and possibly rethink our participation in the United Nations.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will yield again, I applaud the remarks that were made by Ambassador Scali the other day, and I think that most unfortunate things have been happening at the United Nations. However, the situation there is totally different from the UNESCO situation.

We need the United Nations Forces that are on the ground in the Middle East. We certainly need to keep those forces there and we have to support the United Nations in that respect.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOWERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. If the gentleman heard the colloquy I engaged in with the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organization, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) has indicated that he will hold hearings on our entire position within the United Nations, which I think are long overdue.

Mr. FLOWERS. I certainly agree with the gentleman. I appreciate his comment, and I share the gentleman's interest in the Middle East situation.

However, I think the problem with the United Nations extends far beyond the Middle East situation. If we perceive the United Nations only through eyes fixed on the Middle East and not the entire worldwide situation, we are not doing our job fairly as representatives of all the people of America.

Mr. WOLFF. If the gentleman will yield, my reference was not comparing, by any means, the Middle East situation to the entire posture of the United Nations and particularly the nations who have entered the United Nations and the use, by the way, of coercion by certain nations who are able to pay for votes within the United Nations.

December 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 11607

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOWERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to say I support fully the leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) in offering his amendment on UNESCO.

The action taken by UNESCO against Israel was blatantly political. Thus, it was not only illegal under UNESCO's own charter—which forbids it to engage in political activities—but it was also unconscionable. UNESCO's action was prompted by Arab blackmail—pure and simple.

It is outrageous that the Arab countries are not only going to impoverish the world economically by their high oil prices, but are going to attempt to impose their own intellectual dictatorship on everybody. The United States cannot stand idly by while the Arab governments—who themselves have barely contributed pennies to support educational, scientific, and cultural development in the world, much less in their own countries—try to subvert the instruments of world peace into a weapon against Israel.

The amendment offered by my colleague from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) puts the United States firmly on record against this Arab blackmail. I fully support it.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOWERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KOCH. I support the Bingham amendment.

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I want to state my support of the Bingham amendment which calls for the termination of all U.S. aid to UNESCO until that organization repeals its anti-Israel resolutions, which deny cultural aid to Israel and exclude her from the agency's regional groupings. The Senate passed the Case amendment on December 4 to the foreign aid authorization bill which terminates U.S. aid to UNESCO, and we in the House must do the same. I believe it to be in the national interest of the United States as well as a moral imperative that we oppose the arbitrary, immoral, and unjustified actions of UNESCO.

Recent actions by the United Nations General Assembly can only be described as immoral when that body legitimized the terrorist Palestinian Liberation Organization. At that time, I asked that the United States consider withdrawal from the United Nations General Assembly for we can no longer stand by and allow the United Nations to "justify in advance Israel's physical annihilation" to use the words of Raymond Aron and Jean-Paul Sartre.

It is apparent that another body of the United Nations, the U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, which is chartered for nonpolitical activities and dedicated to intellectual freedom and cultural concerns, has approved

arbitrary and discriminatory political reprisals against the State of Israel. These anti-Israel resolutions which were recently adopted directly violate UNESCO's *raison d'être* and run counter to the principles which the United Nations purports to defend.

In voting against these resolutions, the U.S. delegation to UNESCO described them as "a completely unjustified sanction upon a member state of this Organization, for reasons that seem to us to be largely motivated by political considerations."

Are we to support this organization that violates its own statutes and principles? It is a fact that the United States supplies almost a quarter of UNESCO's biennial budget of \$170 million. Outstanding European, Israeli, and United States scholars in the sciences and humanities have already severed their ties with UNESCO. France's designated minister for women, Francoise Giroud, recently refused to appear at a UNESCO session, and the Government of Switzerland has already reduced its contributions to UNESCO. We in the United States must not fail to take a strong stand against actions that threaten the existence of democratic principles.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOWERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's yielding.

I, too, support the amendment of my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM), and rise in support of it. The treatment of Israel by UNESCO and the U.N. in general is deplorable and what is more, highly inconsistent with the U.N. Charter. I would also like to say that I certainly concur with the gentleman that the total funding of the U.N. is an issue with this Congress and that if this House had the issue of funding of the United Nations before it today, there would be some awfully surprised members of the United Nations at what our actions would be. I frankly am fed up with much of what goes on in the United Nations and this amendment is a worthwhile attempt to bring some sanity and responsibility to that organization. I congratulate Mr. BINGHAM on his amendment and urge its adoption.

(Mr. KEMP asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOWERS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Later on I will offer an amendment to reduce the authorization for all United Nations agencies from last year's level.

(Mr. FLOWERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I should have said this before a lot of the Members got up and spoke as I do not want them to be disappointed, but there

is no money in this bill for UNESCO, not one single dime.

The gentleman from New York had an amendment similar to the one adopted in the Senate, but it would have been subject to a point of order.

The gentleman modified it, and directed it to this bill.

As the chairman of the committee, I will be glad to take the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to the conference, and maybe we can perfect its form and language so as to work the will of the House.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize this area of concern. I voted to increase the authorizations for Israel that are in this bill. The diligent efforts of Secretary Kissinger have brought a cease-fire in the Middle East but the danger of conflict still exists. Israel can only survive this difficult period of uneasy quiet if it is strong. The real danger to Israel comes from those of her Arab neighbors whose radical governments are supplied by the Soviet Union and from guerrilla groups inspired and supplied by the Chinese Communists.

The committee's commendable understanding of Israel's position unfortunately did not carry over to other countries in other areas where the danger to national survival is no less pressing. Consistency in policy would require continued strong support for South Vietnam and Korea where the committee's action fell short of what I believe to be necessary support.

And now, Mr. Chairman, let me address myself very specifically to the amendment before us:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the reasons why this amendment has been offered, and why the amendment has such overwhelming support. But, just for the purpose of necessary clarification, I would like to have the Members keep in mind the fact that there is a distinction between the long-term goals of the United Nations and unfortunate unwise, short-term politics.

What we really saw in the U.N. 3 weeks ago was some old-fashioned logrolling in which the black African States and the Arab States cooked up their little deal, the deal was to expel South Africa from this General Assembly session, which the Arab States supported for the support of the black African States on the move giving the PLO the floor to address the United Nations and discuss the situation in the Middle East.

It is my hope that as a result of legitimate criticism, that this sort of action will be avoided at the next session of the United Nations General Assembly.

The logrolling which they engaged in a few weeks ago at the U.N. was deplorable.

I commend the objectives of the amendment, even though I have doubts

H 11608

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 11, 1974

as to whether it will achieve the purpose of the sponsors.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if something could be done today about the proposed pay increase for employees of the United Nations? The bankrupt United Nations is about to put into effect a pay increase that would provide its employees with 42.6 percent above U.S. Federal workers. I would ask the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) who has had a lot of contacts in the U.N., or the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) who is a former Ambassador to the United Nations, whether they think we can do something in this bill, or should do something in this bill to stop such an outlandish pay increase—an increase for which we would pay 25 percent, and perhaps more.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Is the gentleman from Iowa advocating a 42-percent increase for the Federal Government employees?

Mr. GROSS. No. It is your former associates in the United Nation who are seeking a 42.6 percent increase.

Mr. DERWINSKI. No. The gentleman from Iowa has to please understand the situation, and that is that the United States does not run the United Nations. We do our level best to provide leadership, but we cannot perform miracles. The more support, however, that Congress gives those who work in the United Nations for the long-term objectives of the United Nations will help to provide a better world than the one we are presently living in.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not think, as one who is skilled in the manipulations and maneuverings of the United Nations, that in some way we here today might pass another one of these sense-of-Congress resolutions stating that they should not increase the pay of their employees in the United Nations to a point 42.6 percent above that of workers for the Federal Government, and who will pay for that increase, or at least 25 percent of it?

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman from Iowa could offer such a sense-of-Congress resolution but, unfortunately, it will not have much effect.

The real tragedy that we face today, if I may be just a little personal, occurred when the gentleman from Iowa passed up the opportunity to serve in the United Nations, because had he done so I am sure that would have been to the mutual benefit of both the United Nations and the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I never made a better decision in my life than to step aside and let the gentleman from Illinois take that job among the polyglots.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman from Iowa has no idea what he missed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY Mr. FRASER

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRASER: Page 24, strike out lines 3 through 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 28. (a) The aggregate amount of—

(1) funds obligated or reserved for military assistance, including supply operations, under chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(2) the acquisition cost of excess defense articles, if any, ordered under part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and not charged against appropriations for military assistance;

(3) credits, including participations in credits, extended pursuant to section 23 of the Foreign Military Sales Act; and

(4) the principal amount of loans guaranteed pursuant to section 24(a) of the Foreign Military Sales Act;

with respect to South Korea shall not exceed \$145,000,000 for fiscal year 1975 until the President submits a report to the Congress after the date of enactment of this Act stating that the government of South Korea is making substantial progress in the observance of internationally recognized standards of human rights.

(b) After the submission of the report under subsection (a), the aggregate amount described in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of such subsection with respect to South Korea shall not exceed \$165,000,000 for fiscal year 1975.

(c) The provisions of section 506 and section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or of any other law, may not be used to exceed the limitation under subsection (a) or (b).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, in the bill as reported from committee there are two limitations placed on aid to Korea, \$100 million for grant military aid, and \$15 million for excess defense articles, so that those two limitations together would be \$115 million. However, those two limitations do not cover foreign military sales, and in an effort to work out an acceptable amendment in consultation with both sides, we have come to the amendment which has been offered which would raise that amount to \$145 million for Korea, and if there is improvement in the human rights situation, it would go to \$165 million. I think the reasons for this are quite clear.

When President Ford visited Korea, according to news accounts, he, himself, brought to the attention of the Korean leadership quite forcefully the importance of that government's efforts to attempt to improve their treatment of their own people with respect to problems of political repression and imprisonment. I think the amendment that we have here is generally acceptable. It represents a compromise from a number of considerations, and unless there is an interest in further elaboration of the difficulties there, or the reasons for the amendment—

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I must say that the gentleman certainly has arrived at a compromise situation regarding the question of Korea, but I find it very difficult to understand singling out one or two nations in the world on the question of repression and political incarceration without addressing ourselves, as we have in the amend-

ment that the gentleman offered some time ago in committee, to all nations throughout the world who are repressing their people. I oppose repression wherever it exists and would hope that the progress of lifting the decrees in Korea continues uninterrupted. It would be tragic indeed if Korea misinterpreted the feelings of the American people regarding the denial of human rights and true democracy. It would be equally tragic if this Nation turned its back on Korea who has been a faithful ally.

In another area we have under the military sales program engaged in military sales with the Government of Britain. At present there exists in the north of Ireland some 500 political prisoners, men, women, and children who have without trial and without charges, been incarcerated without any hope of their getting out of prison. Yet, we do not single out a nation such as this. Why is it we just take one or two nations and single them out on the question of repression or torture? We cannot condone this activity wherever it rears its ugly head. Amnesty International singled out some 60 nations that are guilty of torture. I think it is high time that we as a nation stop our aid to all countries or stop our assistance of any form to all countries that are guilty of torture or repression. Singling one or two nations out of the myriad who practice this activity is a concession of approval to the others who continue repression.

Mr. FRASER. I appreciate the concern the gentleman has. One of the reasons it is of concern to us is because of the enormous investment of American lives and treasure in Korea. One thing we fear will happen if we do not reinforce a sense of decency and fair play by those leaders in Korea is that the nation of Korea will fall further away from those standards of fair play. We must assure that our defense aid is in behalf of the kind of government that respects the basic rights of its people. We have an important relationship with the Korean people, one that goes back over two decades or more, and I just hope we find a way to encourage the leadership to act so as to encourage help from this Congress. I should try to underscore the fact that we have tried to work this out with the various parties and I think we have achieved a basic understanding with respect to this.

Mr. WOLFF. I think the gentleman's point is very well taken. We cannot sit by while there is this tide of repression that goes on but I would submit to the gentleman we have this same type of relationship existing with Britain and yet I do not find us in any manner, shape or form standing up as a nation and objecting to what is going on in the North of Ireland.

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman makes a point there are other countries that have problems and I have no doubt of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. (On request of Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FRASER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

December 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11609

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment and I think he has reached a compromise we can live with but I wonder about the terminology used on page 2 about the internationally recognized standards of human rights. I wonder if the gentleman can elaborate on human rights.

Mr. FRASER. I think the statement of basic human rights that is most widely accepted is contained in the Declaration of Human Rights passed by the U.N. General Assembly many years ago. It outlines very basic human rights respected by many nations now and accepted by some as part of international law. There are a number of other specific covenants and undertakings internationally agreed to that spell out rights of people but those contained in the universal declaration set forth the basic standards along with the United Nations charter itself.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman think the citizens of the Soviet Union and Red China and Communist Cuba and some of the other so-called Communist nations of the world enjoy those basic human rights?

Mr. FRASER. In my judgment the Soviet citizens enjoy only limited rights which certainly do not conform to all the standards that are internationally recognized. I think our concern now should be that Korea should be different and not become a totalitarian state unrecognizable from other states that are totalitarian, such as the Soviet Union.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. But there are some Russian citizens who are producing chrome which we need in this country.

Mr. FRASER. My basic line in relation to countries in general is that I am prepared to have normal commercial relationships and normal diplomatic relationships with a country no matter what I think of its failure to observe human rights.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment for many reasons, but mainly that I do not think the authors of this amendment and those who support it realize the lack of logic in their attempt to assert human rights for the individual by attacking the internal overall security of friendly nations and cutting their military assistance. I do not wish to debate in any way that there may have been infringements upon the internationally recognized principles of human rights, but I do resent as one who has served ruling our intervention in that great country that we sit here, not with an overall purpose, not with an overall plan, but singling out this country and that country and this ethnic background or that ethnic background or this religion or that religion and we only take affront at those that we are dissatisfied with at this moment, not necessarily yesterday or not necessarily tomorrow.

Now, kindly permit me to tell this body something. Human rights as we know them in the United States, political lib-

erty, freedom of the press, are unknown in other parts of the world, in the exact same context as we know them.

I think one of the greatest mistakes we made in Vietnam is that we wanted them to have elections. We wanted them to have placards. We wanted them to have television. We wanted them to have a presidential election like we have. In the centuries of history of the people of South Vietnam, they could not have that.

Now, with regard to Korea, if some have been to Panmunjom, as I have recently, they are looking into the face of an enemy in Korea that wants to enslave all of Korea, not just the Park regime, but every single person there. Anything we do on this floor to curtail assistance militarily will be sacrificing all of the people, all of that free nation. If any are in jail today they will be in jail when the Communists take over; so we are playing with fire here. We are doing something illogical. We are doing something against the wishes of those who died in Korea from our country.

Korea is a friendly nation. Korea stood with us in Vietnam. I visited with the great Korean soldiers there. To argue that we paid for their ammunition, yes, but every Korean soldier that died in Vietnam kept an American soldier from dying in Vietnam. They were there and they were dying side by side with ours.

Then to come here and affront them by saying, "If you do not do this, we will reduce your military assistance," I think is a sham. I think it is an insult to a friendly people and a friendly country.

Aside from that, my friends, the logic is not there. We are fixing to help those who would enslave all of South Korea. That is what we are trying to do if we pass this amendment. Let us stand by those who have stood by us, let us reason with them about our problems, but I urge you, do not restrict their military, for if you do, you will compromise the security of all the people of that great Nation.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and the Members of the Committee, I just want to say a few words, neither against or in favor of the amendment, because I think that is a foregone conclusion; it will pass, at least in spirit if not in substance.

I think it is high time that we have some words said as were said a moment ago in behalf of our friends in the Pacific, of whom we have very few.

I received a letter from the Ambassador to South Korea today giving me photographs of a tunnel which they just discovered in November, also citing 23,000 violations of the cease-fire since the end of the war.

Now, the very minister who talked to Jack Anderson and others who were in defense of the 12 religious leaders did admit that here we have 100 percent religious freedom. In South Korea it is only 80 percent. In North Korea it is zero.

The so-called innocent student although not 1 of the 186 or so who were rounded up—turned out to be an admitted enemy agent, who in trying to assassinate the president, killed his wife.

I think we have to recognize one way and one time or another that we have some valiant people out there who are doing a pretty good job. They have tripled their per capita income and have a bustling economy.

I think, as was said here, we should look to ourselves where crime is so rampant in the streets and where, as Paul Harvey said, we had more jurors locked up than we had prisoners in Cook County.

I want to say on behalf of the people of Korea that we have had a fine Korean student come to our college in Findlay, Ohio, Honcho Chris Kim. He has become an American citizen, and successful businessman and from this association has come a fine relationship between Korea and the United States. He provided 10,000 volumes of books for our college library in Findlay and as an ambassador of good will for both countries, has brought mutual understanding.

James Wagonseller of Ohio, the national commander of the American Legion, just returned from Korea and has a great deal of regard for these people. He lauded their courage and friendship. Of all the places the President visited, he had no more glowing reception than in South Korea, where millions gave him an ovation.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman that the Korean broadcasting networks used to rebroadcast the Voice of America broadcasts. They stopped them. We wrote to find out why.

It turned out that they broke off the transmission of the Voice of America broadcasts right during the time the Voice of America was reporting about the kidnapping out of the hotel in Tokyo of the last candidate to oppose President Park. I am sure the gentleman is well acquainted with that incident.

Mr. GUYER. I am aware of all of it.

Mr. FRASER. That was the political opposition leader who was taken by what appears to be the Korean CIA, and taken back to Korea. He is now in the country and not permitted to leave the country. Since that time the Voice of America has not been rebroadcast in Korea.

I want to help the Korean people, and I think the gentleman does also.

Mr. GUYER. I understand.

Mr. FRASER. If we can encourage that government to ease up on the repression and imprisonment of its people, we would be helping them and helping ourselves.

Mr. GUYER. I appreciate the opinion of the gentleman. I think we both know that President Park was elected by a majority of 900,000 votes. Also, he disclaimed any knowledge or connection with the kidnapping and did fire the head of the intelligence agency there who may have participated in that incident. I have reason to believe that they, under their president, have made great progress in their economy, in achieving greater individual liberties—and in our peaceful partnership with them.

H 11610

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 11, 1974

We have all too few friends in the Pacific, and I would hate to see them crippled by legislation here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, why does not the gentleman from Minnesota apply this across the board to other nations, and there are some 60 in the list I have here, to which he referred not long ago? Why does he want to apply it only to some and not to all?

Mr. GUYER. We have personal definitions on what constitutes either church members or Christians. I want to say that while it is always complimentary to be a member of a church, that by being a member does not make a person a Christian any more than standing in a garage makes a person an automobile. There are all kinds of people under all kinds of labels. Real Christian leaders are not causing problems in South Korea, nor are they being persecuted.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States indicated the concern of the United States in Korea to the whole issue of human rights. The Congress has indicated its concern already in the language of the bill. The pending amendment is a further compromise on the subject.

As I recall, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota to help me refresh my memory. The program under the House bill would be \$185 million. Would the cut under the gentleman's amendment be \$20 million? Am I correct on that, if all the steps were to be taken? Since the amendment provides that after the President's report the ceiling would go from \$145 million to \$165 million.

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman is correct. And from last year, they would only be cut \$10 million, but I have some reason to believe that even without the language in the bill, Korea would not get any more than that.

Mr. FASCELL. So the real effect of the amendment is to be providing an incentive for the country to take some corrective steps.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would not discount the friendship the nation of Korea has shown for the United States or its people and, contrary to some of the arguments that have been made here today, I believe this is an expression of the friendship for the people of Korea that we provide in this legislation, this incentive that the Government shall honor human rights within that country.

What is special about that country? I will tell you what is special about it. A dear first cousin of mine who gave his life in that country is special about it. Many thousands of other Americans who died so that there might be freedom in Korea is special about it. The billions of dollars of the wealth of this republic that went into the cause of human freedom in that country is special about it.

I think we have a special obligation

to lend our influence to the cause of freedom and of human rights within that society into which flowed so much of our wealth and for which so much American blood flowed a few years ago.

I cannot find fault in lending our influence to the cause of human rights and human freedom anywhere, and I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

This amendment would limit all military and supporting assistance to Korea to \$145 million in fiscal year 1975.

This is only about 20 percent less than Korea received in the last fiscal year, where the figure was \$175 million.

The amendment would, however, provide an additional \$20 million for Korea if the President determined, and reported to Congress, that progress has been made in respect to human rights. It really brings it up to \$165 million, which is only \$10 million less than what Korea received last year.

The committee debated this issue of aid to Korea during the markup of the foreign aid bill; and because of the reported gross violation of human rights in that country, the committee itself put a limit of \$115 million on military aid and excess defense articles for Korea in fiscal 1975.

Afterwards, the committee rejected additional amendments further restricting aid to Korea. It was before, of course, the President's trip and he got the results.

Mr. Chairman, I am now going to support the Fraser amendment. It will not cripple Korea's ability to defend itself, and I feel if we look at the table for Korea that it is a compromise, a great compromise on the part of the gentleman from Minnesota. I intend to support the amendment and take it to the Senate, where the Senate has a much lower figure. This will be a good amendment on the part of the House, and I strongly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FRASER) there were—ayes 64; noes 44.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 13, line 21, strike out "\$154,400,000" and insert "\$127,822,000" in lieu thereof.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I find it incredible that this administration, which claims to be fighting inflation, and in view of the dire financial and economic conditions of the country, would call for a foreign handout bill of \$2 billion 600 million. I am just trying to cut a relatively small amount out of this bill and put this item back to where it was last year. It ought to be cut far deeper.

I am trying to appeal to just a little reason around here concerning the expenditure of the public's money.

Last year Congress authorized \$127.-822,000 for voluntary contributions to international organizations, and that is what this is all about. It also authorized \$150 million for fiscal year 1985. That figure was a shot in the dark. But the Executive was quick to live up to it and even increase it.

Let us not forget that in the State Department authorization there is \$151.-132,000 for "assessed contributions" for the United Nations and its specialized agencies. That includes \$19,617,000 for that organization known as UNESCO.

The main reason for the jump from \$127.8 million to \$154.4 million this year is the U.N. development program, which has gone up about \$20 million. The so-called underdeveloped nations are running the U.N. and setting the pace to determine how much the United States and other principal contributors should pay. One reason the underdeveloped countries are getting further underdeveloped is because of the increased cost of oil.

If the United Nations wants to court the leaders of the Palestine Liberation Organization, it should encourage the Arabs to pick up more of the check.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply cuts \$26½ million and holds our contribution to last year's handout. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for the Committee to look at the reason for the difference in the figures between last year and this year. One of the significant changes is with respect to funding for refugees in the Middle East.

As I believe every Member here recognizes, the problems in the Middle East, including the refugee problem in the Middle East, have grown rather than decreased as a result of events over the last year. One of the last things we need to do is to pull the rug out from under the Middle East refugee program.

The amount of money we are talking about here is peanuts compared to the expenditure of \$2.2 billion we became involved in, in an effort to resupply Israel following the last Middle East war.

If we were to handicap or to cripple the capacity of UNRWA to deal effectively or more effectively—because it is a minimum program—with the people and the problems of the Middle East refugees, we would simply be pouring oil on an already burning fire. It would be the worst kind of penny-wise-pound-foolish act.

It would force a reduction in the Middle East funds at a time when peace in the Middle East is precarious, when we have our Secretary of State working his head off in trying to find a way to bring about some resolution of the conflict. This miniscule amount, in comparison to the contingent liability we face in the Middle East if they go back to war, suggests that this amendment should be defeated.

I am not a great fan of what has been done recently in the U.N. with respect to

certain political issues, but this money, which is voluntary money, does not touch that problem.

The money in this bill goes for such things as the Children's Fund, the U.N. development program, the population programs of the U.N., the U.N. Fund for Drug Abuse Control, et cetera. It reaches a wide range of matters of importance to our interests, and I would just plead with the committee not to cut these funds, particularly, as I say, when one of the significant reasons for the difference between this year and last is to help the problem in the Middle East.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out also that if there should be a cut of this size, it would cut into funds that are needed for relief operations in Cyprus and the U.N. forces in Cyprus. It also would cut, quite probably, the funds available for disaster assistance.

I would hope that the committee would not, for whatever reason, decide on a cut of this size, because inevitably the people who are going to be short changed are those who need it most.

Quite obviously, a major assistance program is needed for the refugees in the Middle East, which this inevitably would be cut if this amendment were adopted.

As the gentleman from Minnesota has already pointed out, the reason for the increase this year is that almost \$9 million which was made available in the form of Public Law 480 assistance last year will not be available this year.

Therefore, I urge that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, there will be surprise, I am sure, that I rise in support of the Gross amendment to reduce U.N. funding. However, my vote on this question is predicated on the immoral and illegal actions taken by the United Nations General Assembly. As I have said to my colleagues on prior occasions, I believe the United States should consider withdrawal from the U.N. General Assembly.

On December 6 our Ambassador John Scali addressed the U.N. Assembly and warned against its increased adoption of "one-sided, unrealistic resolutions that cannot be implemented" and its "arbitrary disregard of U.N. rules, even of its charter." I think that Ambassador Scali's statement requires a supporting message from the Congress. One way to voice that sentiment is to reduce these funds. A major beneficiary of the moneys would be the alleged Arab refugees who, for political purposes, have been abandoned in their camps in Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan by Arab nations whose treasuries are swollen with their oil billions. If assistance is needed by the Arab refugees, let moneys extorted from the western countries by Arab oil sheiks be applied for that purpose.

There will be some who say this particular authorization is not the place to start cutting funds because it includes some worthwhile projects but the fact

is that on every occasion concerning the U.N. and its funding we will be told "this is not the time nor the place." Every beginning is a difficult one but begin we must.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 26, noes 57.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on that, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 226, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 671]

AYES—165

Abdnor	Fruehlich	Nichols
Andrews, N.C.	Fuqua	O'Brien
Archer	Gaydos	Pettis
Armstrong	Ginn	Pike
Ashbrook	Goodling	Poage
Baflalis	Gross	Powell, Ohio
Baker	Gubser	Price, Tex.
Bauman	Gunter	Quillen
Beard	Haley	Randall
Bennett	Hammer-	Rarick
Bevill	schmidt	Robinson, Va.
Blaggi	Hanrahan	Rogers
Blackburn	Harsha	Rose
Bowen	Hastings	Roush
Breaux	Henderson	Roussellot
Brinkley	Hicks	Runnels
Broyhill, N.C.	Holt	Satterfield
Broyhill, Va.	Huber	Scherle
Burgener	Hudnut	Sebelius
Burleson, Tex.	Hutchinson	Shipley
Burlison, Mo.	Ichord	Shriver
Butler	Jarman	Shuster
Byron	Johnson, Pa.	Skubitz
Camp	Jones, Okla.	Snyder
Carter	Kemp	Spence
Casey, Tex.	Ketchum	Steed
Chappell	King	Steelman
Clancy	Koch	Steiger, Ariz.
Clausen	Lagomarsino	Stephens
Don H.	Landgrebe	Stubblefield
Clawson, Del.	Landrum	Stuckey
Cleveland	Latta	Sullivan
Cochran	Lott	Symms
Collins, Tex.	Lujan	Talcott
Conlan	McCollister	Taylor, Mo.
Crane	McEwen	Taylor, N.C.
Daniel, Dan	McSpadden	Teague
Daniel, Robert	Macdonald	Thone
W. Jr.	Mahon	Thornton
Davis, S.C.	Mann	Towell, Nev.
Delaney	Maraziti	Traxler
Denholm	Martin, Nebr.	Treen
Dent	Martin, N.C.	Veysey
Devine	Mathis, Ga.	Vigorito
Dickinson	Mayne	Waggonner
Dingell	Mazzoli	Whitten
Donohue	Mezcher	Wiggins
Dorn	Millford	Wolf
Downing	Miller	Wyllie
Duncan	Mitchell, N.Y.	Yatron
du Pont	Mizell	Young, Alaska
Edwards, Ala.	Molloyhan	Young, Fla.
Evins, Tenn.	Montgomery	Young, S.C.
Flowers	Moorhead,	Zion
Flynt	Calif.	Zwach
Fountain	Myers	
Frey	Natcher	

NOES—226

Abzug	Boland	Chamberlain
Adams	Bolling	Chisholm
Addabbo	Brademas	Clark
Anderson,	Bray	Clay
Calif.	Breckinridge	Cohen
Anderson, Ill.	Brooks	Collins, Ill.
Andrews,	Broomfield	Conte
N. Dak.	Brotzman	Conyers
Annunzio	Brown, Calif.	Corman
Arends	Brown, Mich.	Cotter
Ashley	Buchanan	Coughlin
Aspin	Burke, Calif.	Cronin
Badillo	Burke, Fla.	Culver
Bell	Burke, Mass.	Daniels
Bergland	Burton, John	Dominick V.
Blester	Burton, Phillip	Danielson
Bingham	Carney, Ohio	Davis, Ga.
Boggs	Cederberg	Davis, Wis.

de la Garza	Long, Md.	Roybal
Dellenback	McClary	Ruppe
Delums	McCloskey	Ruth
Derwinski	McCormack	Ryan
Diggs	McDade	St Germain
Drinan	McFall	Sarasin
Eckhardt	McKay	Sarbanes
Edwards, Calif.	McKinney	Schneebeli
Ellberg	Madden	Schroeder
Erlenborn	Madigan	Seiberling
Esch	Mallory	Sikes
Evans, Colo.	Matsunaga	Sisk
Fascell	Meeds	Slack
Findley	Metcalfe	Smith, Iowa
Fish	Mezylnsky	Staggers
Flood	Michel	Stanton,
Foley	Minish	J. William
Forsythe	Mink	Stanton,
Fraser	Mitchell, Md.	James V.
Frelinghuysen	Moakley	Stark
Frenzel	Moorhead, Pa.	Steele
Fulton	Morgan	Steiger, Wis.
Gettys	Mosher	Stokes
Gibbons	Moss	Stratton
Gillman	Murphy, Ill.	Studds
Gonzalez	Murphy, N.Y.	Symington
Gray	Murtha	Thompson, N.J.
Green, Oreg.	Nedzi	Thomson, Wis.
Green, Pa.	Nelsen	Udall
Grover	Nix	Ullman
Gude	Obey	Van Deerin
Guyer	O'Neill	Vander Jagt
Hamilton	Owens	Vander Veen
Hanley	Parris	Vanik
Hanna	Patman	Waldie
Hansen, Wash.	Patten	Walsh
Harrington	Pepper	Wampler
Hawkins	Perkins	Ware
Hechler, W. Va.	Peyser	Whalen
Heckler, Mass.	Pickle	White
Heinz	Preyer	Whitehurst
Helstoski	Price, Ill.	Whitell
Hillis	Pritchard	Williams
Hogan	Quile	Wilson, Bob
Holtzman	Rallsback	Wilson,
Horton	Rangel	Charles H.,
Hosmer	Rees	Calif.
Hunt	Regula	Wilson,
Johnson, Calif.	Reuss	Charles, Tex.
Jones, Ala.	Rhodes	Winn
Jones, Tenn.	Riegle	Wright
Jordan	Rinaldo	Wyatt
Karth	Roberts	Wylder
Kastenmeier	Robison, N.Y.	Yates
Kazen	Rodino	Young, Ga.
Kluczynski	Roe	Young, Ill.
Kyros	Roncalio, Wyo.	Young, Tex.
Leggett	Rooney, Pa.	Zablocki
Lehman	Rosenthal	
Lent	Rostenkowski	
Long, La.	Roy	

NOT VOTING—43

Alexander	Grasso	Mills
Barrett	Griffiths	Minshall, Ohio
Blatnik	Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara
Brasco	Hays	Passman
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Podell
Carey, N.Y.	Hinschaw	Reid
Collier	Hollifield	Roncalio, N.Y.
Conable	Howard	Rooney, N.Y.
Dennis	Hungate	Sandman
Dulski	Johnson, Colo.	Shoup
Eshleman	Jones, N.C.	Smith, N.Y.
Fisher	Kuykendall	Tiernan
Ford	Litton	Wyman
Gialmo	Lukens	
Goldwater	Mathias, Calif.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE: On page 16, strike lines 14 through 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following: (b) Section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) by striking out "\$341,000,000" in subsection (a) and inserting "\$377,000,000" in lieu thereof.

(2) by striking out "1972" in subsection (a) and inserting "1975. Of that sum, there shall be available no more than \$200,000,000 for military assistance." in lieu thereof.

(3) by striking out "\$341,000,000" in sub-

section (b) and inserting "\$377,000,000" in lieu thereof.

(4) by striking out "1972" in subsection (b) and inserting "1975" in lieu thereof.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to place a definite ceiling on the amount of funds to be authorized by this bill for assistance to Cambodia.

I am pleased to state that this amendment is cosponsored by my friends and colleagues, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. ESCH, Mr. GUDE, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. McCLOSKEY. I believe it is worthy of support by every Member of this body.

The bill reported from committee does not contain a line item for Cambodia. It does not set ceilings or subceilings on aid to Cambodia. This lack of limitations disturbs us, Mr. Chairman, because the administration requested \$578,000,000 for fiscal 1975, of which 68 percent was to be for military aid. This huge amount of money was requested for a country of only 7½ million people and for a government that controls only a small part of the territory within the boundaries of Cambodia.

I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that aid to Cambodia is a prime area for reductions in the administration's budget. It is a place to save U.S. taxpayers' dollars in this time of severe economic stress. I also submit that, in acting on this authorization, this body should clearly mandate these reductions and savings.

We are asking for a ceiling on expenditures which now help to account for an estimated 30 Cambodians being killed or wounded every day, with no end to the bloodshed in sight.

We are asking for a congressional response to and reduction in an administration request which would exceed U.S. economic aid to all African nations and all Latin American nations and which would be 10 times more than all taxes collected by the Cambodian Government.

Our amendment places a ceiling of \$377 million on all U.S. aid to Cambodia. It also places a \$200 million subceiling on military aid.

The action we are requesting is not unprecedented. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971, contains, in section 655, a definite ceiling on direct or indirect economic or military assistance for Cambodia. Unfortunately, that ceiling pertained only to fiscal year 1972. Our amendment merely changes section 655 to set a similar ceiling for fiscal year 1975.

The bill reported by the committee amends section 655, but only by waiving that section's requirements that funds for Cambodia be specifically authorized by law. Rather than waive such a requirement for specific authorization and thereby create an open-ended spending authorization, we should provide a firm ceiling on such expenditures.

The amendment I have offered will provide such a ceiling as well as a subceiling on military assistance. For the reasons I have stated and for those to be presented by the others who have joined

me in this effort, the amendment deserves to be adopted and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this question of imposing a ceiling on assistance to Cambodia was discussed in committee and decisively rejected. In addition, in my opinion, a cut of this magnitude would inevitably have disastrous consequences in Cambodia.

The gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out in his discussion that 300 Cambodians are wounded or killed every day and that no end is in sight. I would suggest that if we sharply curtail the assistance we give to Cambodia, the inevitable consequence of a cut of this size would be to bring about an end to the situation in Cambodia, but not an end that would be in our interests. It would be inevitable that the Communists would wait for an opportunity for attack when the Cambodian defense effort is weakened.

I would suggest that if we are trying to seek an end to the seemingly endless conflict in Cambodia, we must recognize that we have an obligation to supply a reasonable degree of assistance. I think it would be most unwise to single out this spot for drastic cuts in planned programs. This country is under heavy pressure. I might say that South Vietnam is also at this very moment under heavy pressure. So, I trust we will not approve this drastic step. It would be most unwise, in my opinion.

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, according to the estimates which I see made by the Foreign Affairs Committee, the total amount of money that was supposed to be spent for Cambodia completely was \$382 million. This is a ceiling of \$377 million, which seems to be hardly any cut at all.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not know what the gentleman is referring to. The total program for Cambodia is \$580 million. There is \$390.2 million proposed for military aid and for related costs and others.

This proposed cut, therefore, would be a cut of over \$200 million.

Mr. ASPIN. If the gentleman would yield further, that was from the original request.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes, I just described one program.

The amount programmed for Cambodia is over \$200 million more than the gentleman from Massachusetts is proposing.

Mr. ASPIN. But during the markup, the committee had a suggestion that Cambodia receive \$230 million of the MAP figure. Thus it would be \$230 million plus \$75 million plus \$77 million, for the \$382 million.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I wish I knew what the gentleman was referring to.

Mr. ASPIN. Is there anybody else who can help on this? Does anybody know what the committee was recommending that we spend on Cambodia at this point in regard to this? The amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts is that we hold spending in Cambodia to \$377 million, and the question arises: What is that a cut from?

I know it is a cut from the administration request, but I wonder if it is a cut from what the committee recommended. What did the committee recommend we spend in Cambodia?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, we did not set any ceiling on that country program.

Mr. ASPIN. Was there a suggestion somewhere there, Mr. Chairman, on how much would be spent in Cambodia?

Mr. MORGAN. No. We cut \$240 million from worldwide military assistance—

Mr. ASPIN. From \$985 to \$745 million. Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, if I could recover my own time, I think it would be most unwise if our committee had specified a total amount for a particular country. In Southeast Asia, it is impossible to predict where the points of pressure are going to be. If we now decide Cambodia is the place that should receive substantially less, that country might prove to be the place that most needs assistance. I hope we do not set a ceiling.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and to endorse what the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) has just said.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, my good friend and neighbor (Mr. CONTE) has said, as Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN pointed out, that he wants to put a ceiling on these Cambodian funds because 300 people are being killed every day in Cambodia. What he did not say is the reason why 300 people are being killed every day in Cambodia is because the North Vietnamese are illegally, improperly and immorally involved in trying to take over the country of Cambodia, and they are ruthlessly killing Cambodians. But those Cambodians, in spite of the fact that they are not the best fighters in the world, have been able to hang onto their country, in spite of everything, and to resist this kind of murderous, terrorist aggression. I think we ought to give them a little credit for what they are doing and a little help.

We said some time ago that we did not want our boys in Cambodia, we did not want any Americans involved in the fighting; we said we would get our Americans out of there and see if these people could defend themselves.

Well, they are defending themselves. We have been giving them the ammunition, as we said we would, we are giving them a little economic aid; but now we suddenly say, "Let's cut off this aid and let the illegal aggressor take over."

When the Arabs attacked Israel, did

we propose to put a ceiling on the amount of money we were going to supply to Israel? Did we suggest that because people were being killed in that conflict we ought not to support those who were defending themselves and their homeland? We did not.

But we have pulled the rug out from under South Vietnam. Now we want to do the same thing in Cambodia. We said these people could not defend themselves. We said they had no guts. We said let us get out, and then we will give them all the equipment they want. Yet now, while they are defending themselves, and doing so remarkably well we now want to take even that away. I think this is a ridiculous way to proceed and the amendment should be overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the desire of the House to cut funds from this bill and the hesitation Members have to invest further money in this part of the world. However, I think we ought to understand that we are dealing here with the survival of a government and the chance for freedom and self-determination of a people.

We do not have troops in Cambodia, but we are providing essential economic and military support to a government which I do not believe can survive without that support. We are also dealing with the chance of a people to know freedom and self-determination.

There is one further thing to be considered. We are dealing here with money to help meet the needs and to provide a chance for life to people who are victims of this conflict in terms of refugee assistance and food assistance. Our Government estimates that the amount of military assistance that will be required as a minimum is well above the amount that will be funded, the \$200 million that will be funded by the gentleman's amendment.

Our Government believes that they must have \$350 million to \$400 million in military assistance funds in order to meet basic needs. About 80 percent of the money requested is to go for ammunition, and without this firepower there is no way the non-Communist government and its forces can continue the fight against what has been an aggression from a foreign power, as well as an internal conflict within that country.

Mr. Chairman, most of the remaining funds will be used for other essential operations, such as air and river operations.

The cut which the gentleman would propose would simply bring the funds below the minimum necessary for the Government to survive and for the forces to continue to fight. This does not even get into the economic needs of the country, which are also great and which are also included in this funding. At least \$100 million is needed for that. Nor do we get into the refugee relief and food programs that are required. At least \$183 million in Public Law 480 is re-

quired, by the estimate of our Government, to feed the people, including many refugees who lack food because of declining production.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will simply be so great in its limitations that I do not see how freedom can survive in that country, how there can be any chance for self-determination, or how there will be any consequence other than great human deprivation and continuing human need, even perhaps starvation. I think we are dealing here with nothing less than the survival of a government.

We have no troops involved, but I hope that we do have some concern for the chance of these people to achieve freedom and the chance of the refugees for life.

Mr. Chairman, I hope it will be the will and the wisdom of this committee to vote down this amendment, certainly in its present form.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. (Mr. ASPIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I think we have heard some very, very eloquent arguments which have been made against the amendment, but I think the speakers have in effect given the arguments for the amendment. What we are talking about here is putting some kind of a ceiling on the amount of money that we are spending in Cambodia.

In the bill from the Committee on Foreign Affairs which is reported to us today there is no ceiling on the amount of money spent. I think we ought to have a ceiling; we ought to know how much will be spent. Congress ought to know how much money we are spending on this proposition. One country like Cambodia can eat up the total amount of money we want to spend on military assistance or the total amount of money we want to spend on Food for Peace.

The gentleman from Alabama says we are going to need \$400 million for Cambodia, but we are only authorizing \$745 million for Southeast Asia. That means well over half is going to one country.

Last year we authorized or we estimated that some \$30 million would be used in Cambodia on Food for Peace for Cambodia, but there was no ceiling put on, and before the year was finished we had spent \$194 million.

When we do not have any ceiling, when we do not have any set amounts and when we do not have any line items and we have open-ended authorizations and open-ended appropriations, the amount of money spent continues to go up.

I think the idea here is that somehow there ought to be some kind of limit, some kind of amount that Congress authorizes, some kind of attempt to say, "This is how much we will spend. This is how much we ought to spend on this war."

The possibilities for us to be dragged into this war are just enormous. There has been a number of reports in the press about current aspects of this war that we

have become involved in. We find out, for example, that we are targeting for the bombers for Cambodia, that we are training their pilots, that the U.S. officials in our embassy are directing the war. We hear reports constantly that there are advisors to Cambodian forces on the ground.

We are paying for this whole thing entirely. We are paying for it when we are training the bombers; we are paying for it when we are training the pilots, when we are picking out the targets, when we are directing the war, when we are doing all of those things.

Even if our own troops are not involved in the fighting, we are still involved very, very heavily in fighting a war there.

I think that the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts is an excellent one. We ought to put a ceiling on our aid to Cambodia, especially military aid. The amount that the gentleman is recommending is not much of a pinch. Three hundred and seventy-seven million dollars is approximately what people have been estimating will be spent. In fact, that is about the suggestion of the committee itself. The gentleman from New Jersey asked me where the figure came from and I would refer him to the Record of August 12. Maybe it will be turn out to be more, but we should have a ceiling. Congress ought to know what we are doing with this money. If we are pouring money down the drain, we are not accounting for it and we do not know what we are doing.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. With a ceiling, are not the hands of the President tied with respect to any unforeseen situation such as all-attacks by the Communists, or a major natural disaster, or something else? Are we not cutting it pretty tight? The committee gave the President some flexibility. We did set a ceiling on the total program. He cannot go above that.

Mr. ASPIN. Yes, but if we spend \$400 million out of \$745 million on Cambodia, if we give it out to just one country, we are completely distorting our priorities.

Mr. MORGAN. I have great confidence that they are not going to curtail military aid to Israel or Jordan and take it over to Cambodia. They are going to have to divide this pie the best they can.

Mr. ASPIN. The gentleman from Alabama says that they are going to take \$400 million for Cambodia. We have \$745 million. If \$400 million is to go to Cambodia, there is just \$345 million left for the rest of the world.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPIN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the gentleman will take the trouble to look at page 5, line 24, he will see that there is a ceiling for Indochina. There is no individual-country ceiling.

My point is that there should only be an area allocation because we are not

H 11614

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 11, 1974

sure of where the particular pressure point of the aggressors is going to be.

My second point is that the ceiling proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts is much too low as it affects Cambodia. An indication of why it is low is the fact that the program proposed for this particular country is over \$200 million more than would be possible under this ceiling.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DERWINSKI TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI to the amendment offered by Mr. CONTE: Strike out "\$377,000,000" each place it appears in the amendment and insert in lieu thereof "\$527,000,000".

In clause (2) of the amendment, strike out "Of that sum, there shall be available no more than \$200,000,000 for military assistance."

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, as offered, the so-called Conte-Aspin amendment would seriously cripple the ability of Cambodia to survive.

This amendment would set a ceiling of \$377 million on all assistance to Cambodia. The Senate bill sets the following ceilings: MAP, \$200 million; Indochina aid, \$100 million; Public Law 480, \$77 million—an aggregate of \$377 million.

The amounts programed for Cambodia for fiscal year 1975 are as follows:

[In millions]	
MAP and related costs-----	\$393.2
Indochina aid-----	110.0
Public Law 480-----	77.0
Total -----	580.2

Thus, the ceiling would be \$203.2 million less than the programs.

A ceiling on all assistance to Cambodia would deny the flexibility needed to meet unforeseen situations, such as an all-out attack by the Communists or a natural disaster; for example, a typhoon or flood.

The United States has not conducted a secret war in Cambodia. Requests for funds for military assistance and training have been considered and approved by the Congress.

Allegations that U.S. military personnel are advising Cambodian military units have been denied by the executive branch. Furthermore, members of the staff of the committee talked to Major Onderker who was named in one newspaper as an adviser. He denied having done so.

In the material presented to the Congress, the DOD shows the number of Cambodians who are programed to receive military training each year. Of the 2,313 to be trained in fiscal year 1975, 1,962 are scheduled to be trained overseas, many of them in Thailand.

The figure that I propose would grant their point of setting a ceiling, but it would do so with a realistic figure with which we would hope that the Government of Cambodia could survive and, through its survival, peace could finally come to all of Southeast Asia.

I do not believe any of us want a situation where the Government of Cambodia would fall, then have South Vietnam outflanked and then, as the gentleman from Wisconsin pointed out, it would re-create the danger of renewing U.S. complications in that area.

It strikes me, recognizing as I do the tremendous integrity of the two gentlemen, that their amendment is basically penny wise and pound foolish: if we have to have a ceiling, then so be it, but at least have a realistic ceiling. Then I would presume that the very least we would have the gentleman from Massachusetts and others who serve on the Committee on Appropriations, having their additional shot give this area special consideration based on their knowledge of the region and the problems. The amendment before us would be identical to the figures in the Senate bill. This would create a situation where there is no adjustment that properly should be exchanged either in conference or later through the appropriations machinery. Therefore in the spirit of practicality and legitimate adjustment of honest differences of opinion, my amendment would establish a ceiling, but it would set a realistic figure.

I think this is the way out for all of us to salvage the necessary functioning of the Government of Cambodia without an open-end authorization and appropriation which so many fear. I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in favor of the Conte amendment.

(Mr. ESCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to place a ceiling on U.S. aid to Cambodia.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to consider this amendment from three different perspectives.

The first is from the point of view of congressional control over the budget. We are dealing here with an open-ended program. There is no "line item" on military aid to Cambodia. However, the House has suggested that Cambodia receive no more than \$230 million in map funds. Under the continuing resolution the administration has been obligating military aid to Cambodia at the rate of \$102 million each quarter. At that rate, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we are dealing with one of the most abused open-ended programs in the Federal budget, and I believe this body has a responsibility to put an end to that abuse. By placing a firm ceiling in that money our amendment fulfills that responsibility.

The second perspective is from a foreign policy point of view. The administration has requested \$578.3 million for Cambodia. That figure is more than all U.S. economic aid to all African nations—\$251 million. It is more than all U.S. economic aid to all Latin American nations—\$372 million. It is more than the yearly U.S. contribution to the International Development Association—\$320 million. This, I believe, is a clear

distortion of U.S. foreign policy priorities; a distortion that our amendment is designed to correct.

The third perspective is from a human point of view. In 1970 total U.S. aid to Cambodia was \$8.7 million. In 1974 total U.S. aid to Cambodia has increased over 80 times to \$708.3 million. What has that additional \$700 million brought us? According to the New York Times, 300 Cambodians are being killed or wounded every day—a total of 600,000 since 1970. One-half the population of Cambodia, over 3 million people, have been made refugees since 1970. This is the policy which is going to bring peace to Cambodia? This is the policy that is, in the words of the committee report, going to prevent a "bloodbath" in that country?

Finally then, our amendment offers us the opportunity to reject the idea that more war will bring peace. I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman said that he advocates a realistic amendment, a realistic ceiling. He has not touched on why he thinks this particular figure which he is advocating is realistic. He proposes an amount which is \$200 million less than the administration's program in the area. The gentleman's argument would seem to imply that if we gave nothing to Cambodia, we would be better off; but he does seem to recognize that there is an obligation of sorts. How does he determine what a realistic ceiling is unless he takes a look at what the administration's program would provide and why it is being requested?

Mr. ESCH. I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey that any figure, whether it be the administration figure or the committee figure, or the figure of the amendment, is an arbitrary figure. What the figure in the amendment suggests is that we can reduce substantially our priorities for Cambodia and emphasize other parts of the world and the needs there, without seriously injuring foreign policy in relation to the Far East. At the same time this amendment would give a clear-cut indication to those in the State Department that we do no longer want to continue on the path that has led us in Cambodia escalation from 1970 to 1974.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment sounds reasonable to me. It sets a ceiling, something that both the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Wisconsin desire.

At the same time, it gives the President some flexibility.

The ceiling does not mean that the full amount would be spent in Cambodia. Earlier big cuts were made by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of \$366 million

December 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H-11615

in Indochina aid and \$240 million in world-wide military assistance. The President will have to shift funds and keep a tight budget to live with those cuts. But in case he does have to shift funds, he still would have the flexibility to meet any unforeseen emergencies in Cambodia.

If we put too low a ceiling, we would be asking for trouble in that area of the world. That is why I would favor the approach of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the so-called Derwinski amendment is defeated. It really does nothing.

What I should like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey or the gentleman from Pennsylvania is, how much is in the pipeline for this area of the world?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not know the answer to the question, but I think the gentleman must know that the amount programed for Cambodia alone is over \$200 million more than the amount which he is recommending. I should like to ask, if I could, on what justification does he base a cut of that size?

Mr. CONTE. If the gentleman from New Jersey will give me an answer to my question, I might tell him.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa. He may enlighten the House here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa. He might enlighten the House. I want to know what is in the pipeline.

Mr. GROSS. On January 12, there was \$27 billion in the foreign aid pipeline.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman can bet his life there is. There is plenty of money in there. All we are asking for is a modest cut, and the same ceiling that the Senate put on. That is all we are asking.

We have heard a great many speeches in this House of Representatives about how the executive branch of the Government has infringed on the House of Representatives. This is another case in point where we are trying to take a little of that power back and put it back in the House where it belongs and we will tell the administration what that amount should be.

Let me tell the Members what they did last year. The administration proposed \$30 billion for Food for Peace for Cambodia. They proposed that amount, but by the end of the fiscal year they had signed Food for Peace agreements totaling \$194.2 million for Cambodia.

Is this what the Members want to go back and tell their constituents when their constituents have all kinds of problems with unemployment and people out of work when they do not have enough money to feed their own families? Do the Members want to use taxpayers' money like passing corn down a rat hole?

Let me read something from the reports prepared by the gentleman's own committee, by "Mr. Ambassador's" own committee. I knew the gentleman when he was not on that committee and did not wear striped pants and he was realistic about these foreign aid appropriations.

Mr. DERWINSKI. He must not be talking about the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CONTE. Let me read this report which his committee set up, and this is about Cambodia. They say:

Beset militarily, riven by internal political divisions, and lacking a firm sense of purpose, the Lon Nol government in Phnom Penh (in Vietnam) is fully dependent for its existence on the military and economic assistance of the United States.

It goes on to say this:

In CY 1973 Cambodia's inflation rate was a staggering 275 percent. Today the working class consumer price index is more than 16 times what it was in 1970 before the war began. Exports in CY 1973 were a mere \$15 million while imports were \$177 million. The rampant corruption, continuing hostilities and the almost total disruption of the transportation system preclude any hope for economic improvement.

That is in a report from the Foreign Affairs Committee.

If the Members want to compound that kind of situation in Cambodia, they should vote for the Derwinski amendment. If they want to tell them to straighten out and fly right, they will kill the Derwinski amendment and vote for my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DERWINSKI) there were—ayes 29. noes 53.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUCHANAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN to the amendment offered by Mr. CONTE: In clause (2) of the amendment, strike out "Of that sum, there shall be available no more than \$200,000,000 for military assistance."

At the end of the amendment add the following:

"(5) by inserting in subsection (b) thereof immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence 'or any funds obligated or the value of any goods, supplies, materials or equipment furnished solely for humanitarian and food assistance in Cambodia'."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment which I will not take much time of the Committee to explain.

I accept the total of the gentleman

from Massachusetts of \$377 million and do not attempt to change that, except in one respect. I do remove in this amendment the subtotal of \$200 million limitation on military assistance so that there is flexibility between the military and economic assistance aspects as to that which is permitted.

As I indicated earlier, there is a crucial need for military assistance in excess of the amount which the gentleman's amendment would permit. We are dealing with the survival of a government and a people who know freedom and self-determination. This simply removes the sublimit without changing the total. There is only one respect in which I change the total, and that is in the area of humanitarian assistance and refugee relief.

As I indicated in earlier debate, there is a terrible human problem in this part of the world of people who are victims of this conflict. This would exempt from the limitation funds used in assistance and support to them.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. I just have a question about the amendment the gentleman is offering. Is the total of \$377 million a limit on the amount of military assistance?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Within that \$377 million.

Mr. ASPIN. Within that \$377 million, but other things covered by the \$377 million, such as refugee relief and things like that, could be added in addition to that; is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; the refugee relief items could be in addition.

Mr. ASPIN. What type of Federal program is the gentleman thinking about?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Refugee relief of various kinds; there are health problems, there are various aspects of refugee problems. This would permit such items without being bound by this limit. The limit would apply to economic and military assistance. Some of it would surely be economic assistance, because as the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out, this is a crying need given the rate of inflation and other economic problems in Cambodia.

I said earlier a minimum of \$350 million to \$400 million was needed for military assistance; however, I assume if they are going to have to live with the \$377 million total limitation the gentleman from Massachusetts has placed upon military and economic aid, that they might see fit to divide, cut a little closer on military assistance and assign a larger amount of the remainder for economic programs; but this would still be the total of economic and military assistance, other than humanitarian and refugee relief. I am sure that my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, would not lay upon the backs of the already overburdened people of Cambodia this further burden of hunger and disease with no relief in sight.

Mr. ASPIN. Does food for peace come

H 11616

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

December 11, 1974

under the \$377 million in this amendment or not?

Mr. BUCHANAN. According to my amendment, food programs could be provided in addition to the limitation of the \$377 million.

Mr. ASPIN. But the gentleman knows that is open-ended. That is part of the problem. Last year we had \$33 million and it went to \$194 million. Unless the gentleman has food for peace under this ceiling, it is meaningless.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would say to the gentleman that the ceiling is not meaningless, because the ceiling provides an absolute ceiling for military and economic assistance well below that which had been the intent of the administration and well below that provided in the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois. Therefore, this is a real reduction below that of the amendment just offered and just voted down and a substantial reduction.

I would say to the gentleman, I would expect as an outside limit an additional \$75 million to be covered by the language of exclusion, if that amount. I would say that would be on the outside of possible additions.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

(Mr. DU PONT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I voted for the Gross amendment reducing the voluntary contributions by the United States to the United Nations by \$27 million—last year's level of funding. I did so in the belief that the amendment applied to administrative expenses of organizations such as UNESCO—the organization that recently cut off contributions to Israel. This is certainly not a time to be rewarding such actions—nor is it a time for increasing administrative expenses at the U.N.

Further discussions with the sponsor of the amendment, however, revealed that it in fact reduced the U.N. Development Fund—one of the organizations that is most necessary to the solution of the food and development problems of the developing nations.

I therefore oppose the Gross amendment and should have voted "No" rather than "Aye." It is not possible to change my vote at this time, but I want to emphasize my opposition to the reduction of the Development Fund.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman just voted for \$26.5 million more than was spent last year for refugee relief. Why is the gentleman wanting more?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am sure my colleague is well aware of the great human problems that ordinarily exist in this part of the world, and there is in fact a great need for refugee assistance that can be provided if my amendment is adopted removing this category of as-

sistance from the limitation of the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I say to the gentleman that we need relief in this country.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, once again I would rise to oppose this amendment to the Conte amendment, and I would tell the Members why.

First of all, we have been spending at the rate of \$102 million per quarter, or on an annual rate now of approximately \$408 million, for military aid. The gentleman's amendment, very carefully drawn, would merely reduce the possibility for military aid to go down to about \$376 million, so it would not be a significant decrease in military aid. So, first and foremost, we must cap the military aid at a realistic figure.

Second, the amendment was carefully drawn so as to suggest that we want to maximize the military assistance up to \$376 million, or almost about where we are now, but at the same time we will be able to bring in other funds for the massive refugee problem.

So, in effect, the impact of the amendment is just to destroy the Conte amendment entirely. I would suggest to the members of the committee that we need to cap the military spending. We need to go into a period of transition in which we indicate that we are not going to continually put major funds into Cambodia disproportionately, and that there are other funds, as the gentleman from Wisconsin suggested, that are giving direct assistance to the massive problem of refugees we have in Cambodia.

There is no question that the refugee problem has been caused in part by actions of other countries, and in part by our own assistance. We must stop the current program and redirect that, not toward war, but toward peace. We can do that by rejecting the Buchanan amendment and supporting the Conte amendment.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I think what the gentleman has said is absolutely correct. The only additional point I think we ought to make is that food for peace is the biggest open-ended drain we have and food for peace is now being used to buy materials for war.

If we have a ceiling where we exclude food for peace, that is where the growth is, from \$30 million to \$194 million last year. A ceiling amendment which does not cover food for peace is not worth anything.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman on his comments. He has stated the case very well. This amendment is an invitation to increase the military aid to a limit which is hardly the restriction we need—it really makes no significant reduction in military aid and provides no limit at all on the food for peace amendment. I hope the committee

will reject the amendment and will adopt the Conte amendment.

Mr. ESCH. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his remarks.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman in the well in his remarks, and oppose the Buchanan amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan is my friend, but this is really not a make-believe amendment. The limitation is a real limitation.

Mr. ESCH. A limitation of \$376 million.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is lower than the limitation suggested by the gentleman from Illinois and higher than the limitation suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I am not playing games with the gentleman. This does provide more military assistance than the Conte amendment would permit but there is a great need also for economic assistance which would not be covered in my exclusion, that will have to be divided within the \$376 million limit, and the refugee assistance is to meet a very real human need.

Mr. ESCH. I would strongly support the matter for refugee assistance, and we are both reaching for that goal. I did not mean to imply that the gentleman's amendment is not a real amendment. It is real in the sense that it increases the Conte amendment to where there is not a realistic cap on military spending, and that was the point I was trying to make for the gentleman from Alabama.

(Mr. ESCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

The amendment was agreed to.

(Mr. SYMINGTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the colloquy on food aid which we just engaged in presents a good point of departure for further discussion of that important subject.

What I would like to say to the committee is that, in concert with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. JOHNSON), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON), and also the parallel effort of the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) did prepare an amendment to submit dealing with the food for peace program. It would restrict the amount of money which can be allocated in fiscal year 1975 to nonhumanitarian uses of

December 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 11617

food for peace, primarily title I, sales and grants, to the total figure that had been contracted for through December 30, 1974, \$250 million. It makes the same provision for fiscal 1976.

Inasmuch as our amendment referred to another law in addition to the one we are now working on, it was susceptible, if not actually vulnerable, to a point of order. But the principle contained in the amendment, which I will make part of the record, is one that the other body has passed by voice vote. It is certainly consistent with the remarks of the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, when he opened the general debate, to point out the need to accent the humanitarian uses of food. It is also consistent with the jurisdiction which his committee now has over the foreign aspects of food and fertilizer assistance. The amendment we had intended to offer reads as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 17234 OFFERED BY
MR. SYMINGTON

Page 24, after line 15, insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE IN THE FORM OF CONGRESSIONAL AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND FERTILIZER ASSISTANCE

SEC. 30. (a) The total amount of funds obligated or expended for agricultural fertilizers and of sales of agricultural commodities (whether for cash, credit, or any other means) under any law in fiscal year 1975 shall not exceed \$250,000,000, and in fiscal year 1976 shall not exceed \$250,000,000, unless

(1) such funds in excess of either such limitation are used to purchase such assistance solely for humanitarian food purposes for countries "most seriously affected" by the economic crisis as designated by the United Nations, or

(2) the President demonstrates to the Congress that the use of such funds to purchase such assistance is solely for humanitarian food purposes.

(b) Section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any other provision of law may not be used to waive the provisions of this section.

The other body has approved a like amendment and I am encouraged to believe it will receive the support of the House conferees.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. In respect to the gentleman's question, I want to assure him I am in sympathy with his objectives. As the gentleman knows, the major purpose of last year's reorganization of foreign aid was to produce more effective help for the poor countries in the areas of food production.

The bill we are dealing with contains \$180 million in additional authorization for food aid, plus what was authorized in the 2-year bill last year.

Also, the other day the House approved a resolution, which came out of our committee, supporting greater effort on the part of all food-producing countries to help those countries which are facing food shortages.

I believe the gentleman from Missouri was a cosponsor of that resolution.

I believe there is a strong feeling in my committee and in the House to move

in the direction which the gentleman is proposing. The amendment which the gentleman has in mind, though, I believe, would be subject to a point of order because it would not be germane to this bill.

I can assure the gentleman, however, that we will keep his proposal in mind as we go to conference with the other body. We will try to work out something which will be consistent with the wishes of the House on the subject the gentleman is interested in.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the gentleman for his kind encouragement. I understand, then, the chairman will bear in mind the wishes of the House. I think they have been pretty well expressed in the colloquy on the subjects throughout this debate, and he approaches the sentiment of the other body's views on this subject.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, it is time for the United States to acknowledge the gravity of the world food crisis. Four weeks ago the major nations of the world, including the United States, met at the World Food Conference in Rome to determine what action could be taken to alleviate the starvation that is spreading so rapidly. Up until this time, we, as a nation, have taken a somewhat calloused attitude toward evidence of this mass starvation, but we did take an active role at the World Food Conference, where a series of goals and resolutions were formulated and accepted. These resolutions called for a reordering of priorities so that higher food production rates will be stimulated and the results distributed more efficiently.

I had intended to offer an amendment today, which if accepted, would demonstrate our awareness of this need for a rapid change in priorities. It would have guided the readjustment of our food programs toward the goal of sending more of our food to those countries specified by the United Nations as "most seriously affected" by the present economic crisis. It would have done this by setting a \$250 million ceiling on the total amount of food assistance we can give to any or all countries that are not designated as needy.

This would have insured a redirection of our food assistance to where it is most needed, without restricting our ability to allocate food assistance for political purposes. We would still have had more than one-third of our agricultural commodities to distribute as support for certain policy objectives. The full text of the amendment is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 10, 1974, at page H11581.

A similar amendment was offered by Senator HUMPHREY to the Senate Foreign Assistance Act of 1974 on December 4, and was accepted into the Senate bill. As the distinguished Senator pointed out in his persuasive arguments for the amendment, the delegates at the World

Food Conference agreed that 7.5 million tons of food must be provided by next July if the one-half of 1 billion people that will face starvation and malnutrition in the next 8 months are to see any relief. Currently, the United States is providing, or planning to provide 1 million tons of the 7.5 million ton total, but we are planning to commit more than twice that amount for political uses. It is this commitment that must change.

I ask my colleagues to recognize the need for such an amendment. One need only look at the facts regarding our 1974 food allocations to realize the need for a change in priorities.

In fiscal year 1974, Indochina was given over \$400 million in food for peace funds, but the Sahel region of Africa, where the world has witnessed the starvation of one-quarter of a million people, received only \$61.5 million under the food for peace program. Pakistan and Bangladesh received similar token amounts of \$37.5 million and \$20.1 million respectively.

I feel that facts such as these speak for themselves. We can no longer shrug aside our responsibility and our obligation to assist those who are most in need. Thousands of people have already perished from starvation, and millions more are reaching that point. We, who have just returned from a Thanksgiving table laden with food, must regain a humanitarian outlook on our food assistance programs.

A limitation such as I suggest, already in the Senate version of the bill, requires no additional expenditures. It does not raise our volume of food contributions. It only redirects them to those countries that need them, thereby protecting those countries from extreme economic disorder brought on by famine and distress.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of assurances from the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee that he will look sympathetically upon the Senate language on this subject when the bill is in conference, just because of the parliamentary situation that exists, I will refrain from offering the amendment today. However, I most strongly urge my colleagues to reexamine the serious misallocation of U.S. food aid as reflected in the figures I have cited.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER: Insert after line 24 on page 23 the following:

EXCHANGE OF NECESSARY OR STRATEGIC RAW MATERIALS

SEC. 28. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 661. Exchanges of Certain Materials—

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever the President determines it is in the United States national interest, he shall furnish assistance under this Act or shall furnish defense articles or services under the Foreign Military Sales Act pursuant to an agreement with the recipient of such assistance, articles, or services which provides that such recipient may only obtain such assistance, articles, or services in exchange for any necessary or strategic raw material con-

trolled by such recipient. For the purposes of this section, the term 'necessary or strategic raw material' includes petroleum, other fossil fuels, metals, minerals, or any other natural substance which the President determines is in short supply in the United States.

"(b) The President shall allocate any necessary or strategic raw material transferred to the United States under this section to any appropriate agency of the United States Government for stockpiling, sale, transfer, disposal, or any other purpose authorized by law.

"(c) Funds received from any disposal of materials under subsection (b) shall be credited to the appropriations of the agency of the United States Government in an amount which except for this section would have been credited to such agency for its furnishing of the assistance or defense article or service. Any funds not so credited shall be deposited as miscellaneous receipts in the United States Treasury."

Renumber the following sections accordingly.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, is this an amendment to title V? If so, have we read title V?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that we have not reached that point.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if this is an amendment to title V?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the amendment is to title III.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is to title III.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the reference was to page 28.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, are we considering an amendment relating to page 28?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment relates to page 23. The amendment as read relates to title III, page 23 of the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman attempting to amend two titles here?

The CHAIRMAN. Not according to the version which has just been read, as far as the Chair understands the situation.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) in support of his amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Does the gentleman have copies of his amendments? The amendments that we have do not appear on page 23. We would like to know what it is we are discussing.

Mr. MILLER. Yes. As a matter of fact, I have a copy, but since the bill was opened for amendment to the title only, it was necessary for the Clerk to start to read at the point: "insert after line 24 on page 23," the second line of the amendment. He started to read at that point. That would insert the amendment in title III.

If the amendment is approved, then an amendment would be offered to strike the section in title V with respect to raw materials.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, the amendment that I have received says nothing about where it is to be inserted.

Do I understand that the gentleman says that if it is accepted, it will involve striking a title we have not come to?

Mr. MILLER. If it is accepted, an amendment would be offered then, for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment, as read by the Clerk, did specify where it was to be inserted: "insert after line 24 on page 23."

Mr. MILLER. If I may continue, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to do one thing: It would allow this Nation to receive in return some natural resources, primarily the strategic metals, that we so badly need in this Nation, for the foreign assistance that we are now sending out.

We have sent out since 1946 some \$158 billion worth of foreign assistance. If we included the interest on that money, it would come to about \$253 billion.

We need today the strategic metals because by the year 2000, on the basis of the known reserves that we have, we will be out of 11 of the 13 major strategic metals that are keeping this Nation running today.

We are an industrialized nation. We are digging; we are mining; we are producing our raw materials from within the country; and then we are manufacturing and then sending abroad many of the manufactured items that we produce, which, in turn, means that we are depleting our natural resources. It is just that plain.

All we are asking is that other countries will in turn send to us the natural resources that they have.

The cartels that have been put together show quite plainly what has happened recently. The OPEC are now working against us. Let us face it. They have quadrupled the price of petroleum.

Not long ago, the bauxite countries, seven of them, as a matter of fact, decided that they wanted to triple the price of bauxite.

There is no doubt in my mind that the other strategic metals will also go up in price. I think it is foolish for us to send our assistance to other countries without receiving something in return.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MILLER. We import 100 percent of our chrome.

The Philippines received aid in 1973 of \$161.7 million.

In total aid since World War II they have received from the United States over \$2,274,000,000. We should have been receiving chrome from the Philippines.

Let us go a little further. Tin. Most of the Members are aware of the problem that we have had with tin and tin plate only recently, but we import 78 percent of our tin. Bolivia has tin. They are receiving \$31.4 million aid this year.

Let us go a little further: We need zinc. Brazil has zinc, and they in turn are receiving \$71.5 million aid, and have received almost \$3 billion since World War II. Then let us go a complete cycle. They have also invested \$5 million back in our national debt. That is our money going full cycle, that is borrowing money from Brazil so that we in turn can send them foreign assistance.

If we want to go a little further we have quite a list of countries that have purchased into our national debt. Western Germany, that has purchased almost \$24 billion of our national debt. They are not in the bill. We know that. But we know that over the years we have sent many, many hundreds of millions of dollars there.

Japan has purchased some \$10 billion of our national debt. We know over the years before they become industrialized that we sent many hundreds of millions of dollars there.

I hope the Members will support the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which would enable the United States to exchange our foreign aid for strategic or critical raw materials and supplies. As a sponsor of H.R. 14561, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment which would put our Nation in a better position to meet the future demands for the many basic materials which we import.

For too many years, this country has given its foreign aid away. In return, this good will has fostered ill will and has resulted in American businesses being expropriated and in other rebuffs. It seems that whenever a recipient of our foreign aid can put us over the barrel, as has been done by the oil-producing nations, it does so without reservation and without any consideration of our past assistance and friendship. Venezuela which has received over \$361 million in direct foreign aid over the past 10 years wasted little time in increasing their tax export price after the Arab oil embargo. This increase has had a severe impact on the residents of my congressional district and their electric bills. I, for one, do not believe my constituents should have to pay out twice to Venezuela in the form of higher prices for their oil and additional taxes to help finance economic and military assistance programs.

This policy of Venezuela, coupled with the Arab oil embargo, and the suggested actions of those countries which produce coffee and bauxite, for example, indicate that these and other supplies may be held for ransom. Why, then, should the United States provide free assistance to these nations? Why, then, should this Congress continue to dole out the taxpayers' funds to countries which do not hesitate to tighten the screws on our economy whenever they have the opportunity?

This amendment, if adopted, would make a very constructive revision in our foreign aid assistance program by allowing the United States to exchange or barter its foreign aid for the minerals, natural resources, and other materials we import. In view of these recent "black-

mail" attempts, in view of our increasing dependence on raw material imports, and in view of the continuing increase in our balance-of-payments deficits, I strongly recommend that this amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 be approved so that the United States will begin getting something more than "kicks in the teeth" in return for the billions of dollars sent overseas in the form of foreign aid.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Ohio. The economic situation in the United States in part has been brought about by a failure to recognize the role other countries can and do play in our industrial production. We have assumed that not only can we expend our seemingly limitless natural resources, but after we have earned the capital these resources generate, we can give too much of it away in foreign aid.

And where does this foreign aid go? In many cases to countries who have supplies of raw materials vital to the United States far in excess of our own. As we deplete our resources, often to produce that capital by which our assistance programs have been generated, we are throwing away assets which will influence the future strength of the United States.

We are all aware of the need to balance the budget, cut back all wasteful spending, and reduce our debt ceiling. This amendment would at least insure that the tremendous drain on our national wealth caused by foreign assistance giveaway programs would in part be offset by the return of vital resources to the United States which are or may be in short supply. As I understand this amendment, it would not eliminate as a matter of course aid sent to a country which has no vital resource with which to barter, but it would insure that those countries which do have materials vital to our present and future well-being would not receive our aid unless a beneficial trade were made.

My voting record in the House of Representatives has shown that my preference is to eliminate wasteful spending of our tax dollar abroad. I feel that the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague at least gives the United States some return on investment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

The gentleman from Ohio offered this proposal last year. During the debate, I promised the gentleman that during the hearings this year we would hear him and we did.

During this year's hearings on foreign aid, several Members came and testified with the gentleman from Ohio. They were the gentleman from California (Mr. KETCHUM), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER).

There are many vital issues and factors involved in a proposition of this

kind, some of them being: What sort of goods are to be bartered? At what price? What Government agency should receive the goods? What are the implications of efforts to maintain free trade—these are the kinds of questions that are involved.

So the committee then instructed the Congressional Research Service to prepare an initial study of this proposal by the gentleman from Ohio. And they came back with many other questions. Since there were many unanswered questions, the committee concluded that it would be best to have a further study done before initiating such a program.

For that reason the committee adopted an amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GUYER). That is in the bill on page 28. It directs the President to study all of the factors involved, and report back to the Congress by March 31, 1975, which is just approximately 3½ months away.

We believe that this is a sound way to proceed.

The barter approach has been tried before in a very limited way, and it offers some advantages. We would like to capitalize on some of those advantages, but we must know which way we are going, because there are many scarce commodities in the world, and the United States should have access to them.

For that reason I believe that the committee's approach, included on page 28, is the way to move. Therefore I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LONG
OF MARYLAND

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONG of Maryland: Page 14, line 4, insert the following immediately before the quotation marks:

Provided, That a reasonable amount of funds authorized under this section shall be made available in fiscal year 1975 to strengthen international procedures which are designed to prevent the unauthorized dissemination or use of nuclear materials. The President shall report to the Congress not later than July 1, 1975, concerning actions taken by the United States to strengthen the procedures described under the preceding sentence.

(Mr. LONG of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It would require the administration to make an effort to strengthen international nuclear safeguards. Second, my amendment would require the President to report to Congress by July 1, 1975, on the actions taken and the progress made in this effort.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The committee on this side has examined the gentleman's amendment. Our committee has always been deeply concerned about improving nuclear safeguards.

Under an amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FRASER) in this bill we provided for \$500,000 additionally for this purpose. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland goes in the same direction, and, speaking for the majority side of the committee, the committee will be happy to accept his amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am not sure I speak for the minority side, but I can say the minority was not given the courtesy of seeing a copy of the amendment, so it will not be possible for me to approve or disapprove of it. I would think as a courtesy we might have received a copy so we would have had an indication of what the gentleman is proposing. Even at this late hour I would appreciate getting a copy, if there is an extra one available.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I will be very happy to supply a copy. I want to apologize to the ranking minority member for not providing him a copy of my amendment. It was certainly not intentional on my part.

While the gentleman is studying the amendment, let me point out that now is a propitious time for an effort to strengthen international nuclear safeguards. The present international nuclear safeguards that are administered by the International Atomic Agency are designed only to detect, not to prevent, the diversion of nuclear material, such as plutonium, for use in nuclear weapons. The IAEA safeguards have very little to do with physical security—such as guards, fences, alarms, etc., and there are serious questions whether even the IAEA detection and inspection systems are being adequately implemented. We must have tougher safeguard systems that include physical security measures, as well as detection measures, and the United States should take the lead in toughening these safeguards.

The Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference will be held in May 1975, to review the operation of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in order to fulfill the goals of the treaty. Thus, an effort to strengthen international nuclear safeguards is timely.

The Indian nuclear explosion of May 18, 1974, has shown that the present system of safeguards is not adequate by the very fact that India was able to obtain plutonium for her nuclear device from a reactor—supplied by Canada—not under IAEA safeguards.

Unless international nuclear safeguards are strengthened and enforced throughout the international community, it will be inevitable that more countries

develop nuclear weapons because of the following facts:

First, 44 countries that do not yet have nuclear weapons have nuclear reactors for power or for research. Nuclear reactors, through the production of plutonium can lead to nuclear weapons.

Second, the United States has sold nuclear reactors to 33 countries. Of these 33 countries, 21 have not ratified the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty—adherence to which by all countries would help prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons. Among these 21 nations are India, Argentina, South Africa, Brazil, Indonesia, and South Africa.

The United States has great leverage to initiate and lead an effort to strengthen international nuclear safeguards because:

The United States is the leading supplier of nuclear power reactors and is likely to remain so for several years;

France, Japan, and Italy, potential suppliers of nuclear technology, are all dependent on U.S. licenses from GE and Westinghouse for their nuclear power reactor technology; and

Finally, the United States is the major supplier by far of enriched uranium fuel necessary for most power reactors. The Soviet Union does have some surplus of enriched uranium fuel which it is selling abroad, but no additional fuel processing plants in Europe or elsewhere will begin operation until 1980 or later.

In summary, my amendment simply stipulates that the administration, provide a "reasonable amount of funds" for the purpose of developing stronger international nuclear safeguards from the funds under this section.

Second, my amendment requires the administration to report on what actions it has taken pursuant to this requirement.

My amendment leaves to the administration the determination of the funds necessary for this effort, but it places pressure on the administration to undertake to strengthen international nuclear safeguards with the goal of preventing diversion of nuclear material, not simply detecting such diversion as the present IAEA safeguards are designed.

Mr. Chairman, although I have much more to say, I have no desire to go on and elaborate on this. If the gentleman feels that he can accept this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am certainly in no position to accept the amendment, I might say to the gentleman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is it not true that certain numbers of copies of any amendments are supposed to be available to both sides? Is that not part of the rules of the House, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. There is an obligation

on the Clerk to do that. Occupants of the Chair have often encouraged Members to furnish a certain number of copies to each desk.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Again, I apologize to the gentleman. I promise that I will not do this again.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no rule which would prohibit the consideration of an amendment which had not been circulated by the Clerk or by the Member.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BIAGGI

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BIAGGI: Page 20, line 3, strike out "\$15,000,000" and insert "\$40,000,000" in lieu thereof.

Page 20, after line 8, insert the following: "(b) Of the funds appropriated to carry out section 639 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, during fiscal year 1975 not less than \$25,000,000 shall be made available to Cyprus for the purposes of such section 639."

Page 20, line 9, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)" in lieu thereof.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act to provide \$25 million in emergency aid to the war-ravaged nation of Cyprus. I consider this amendment to be one of the most important we will consider today, for it can represent an important step in relieving the suffering and misery of the people of Cyprus.

It has been almost 5 months to the day since Turkey in explicit violation of the Foreign Assistance Act unleashed her forces for an invasion of Cyprus. In the succeeding months, Turkey has maintained control of between one-third and 40 percent of the island, have killed more than 4,000 Cypriots, and left more than one-quarter of a million Greek Cypriots homeless, struggling as refugees.

It is further estimated that the Cyprus conflict has cost the Cypriot economy a loss of as much as \$1 billion. Consider the present situation in Cyprus:

According to Cyprus' Foreign Minister, Turkey occupies as much as 70 percent of the island's productive resources.

Two of Cyprus' major cities, Kyrenia and Famagusta, have suffered great damages to their lucrative tourist trade in a year when they expected more than 250,000 visitors.

Cyprus has been forced to forfeit millions of dollars a day in vital factory production with the most direct consequence being the astronomical unemployment rate which threatens the future economic security of this nation.

Three months ago, it was estimated that without an immediate solution to the crisis, the average Cypriot income would be cut in half by March 1975.

Finally, Cyprus is anticipating its worst balance-of-payments deficit in its history. This is compounded by the fact that Cyprus has only enough foreign currency to pay for several months of income.

These facts are not merely put here for statistical effect. These represent human

man tragedies affecting their day-to-day life that people on Cyprus face at the hands of their Turkish invaders. A startling example is the fact that religious services have been banned and more than 170 Greek Orthodox churches in Nicosia, Kyrenia, and Morphou have been closed by the Turks, and several of the more famous Greek Orthodox churches have been reduced to rubble by fires set deliberately by Turkish invaders.

Yet, there are still many among us who will see nothing to this amendment but the amount of money it entails. Yet, what are we really considering here today but a money issue, or is it really the saving of a nation from certain ruin? This Nation in its history has been fortunate; we have never been invaded by a stronger foreign foe using armaments of a supposedly friendly nation.

We have never had our basic freedoms and civil rights seized from us by occupation forces. Perhaps because we have not experienced this, we have a tendency to view these issues with merely superficial concern. It is time for the self-righteous among us to come down and deal with the reality of Cyprus as it is.

The Cyprus crisis as I have indicated on numerous occasions represents one of the sorriest failures of our foreign policy. Our failure to step in immediately and cut off all military aid to Turkey represented an enormous tragedy to the people of Cyprus who now see us as one of the culprits responsible for their present plight. We, in Congress, have allowed an indifferent and biased Secretary of State until today to find a satisfactory solution to the Cyprus crisis, yet what has he done—virtually nothing. We have evoked the embittered feelings of millions of Greek-Americans who view our "Turkey tilting" policies with abhorrence justified.

There are many here today who will expound on the failure of the foreign aid program to fully address the needs of the people of the world. I offer this amendment as a counterargument. This is meaningful aid, one which can spell the difference between survival and destruction for the nation of Cyprus. Our commitment of \$3 million thus far for relief falls far short of the true needs of Cyprus, and further these funds are rapidly dwindling.

The \$25 million I am proposing to provide today represents a more meaningful commitment, one which can help relieve the most urgent of Cyprus' needs; namely, emergency health and food assistance, and housing for the refugees.

I expect the usual raised eyebrows among some of my colleagues who see not what the money will be used for, but rather the fact that I am seeking to increase this bill by \$25 million. Yet, I wonder if these skeptics were confronted by Cypriot refugees, starving, ill clothed, and sick whether they would still see the issue purely on a money basis. Let none of us here today become immune to the misfortunes of our fellow man, particularly in cases when some of the blame can be placed squarely on our shoulders.

The need for passage of this amendment cannot be emphasized too strongly.

Yet, in the final analysis, it will be a vote of conscience, affirming the fundamental commitment of this Congress to assisting the peoples of the world in times of dire need. I call upon all of you today to examine your consciences, consider the plight of the Cypriot people, consider the jarring effects which the invasion and occupation have had on their everyday lives, and how much this \$25 million could help restore the Nation of Cyprus. I contend that, if we all do this today, the logic of my amendment will come shining through.

The nation of Cyprus is in her darkest hour of need, yet she has not come begging to us. It can only hope that we will go to her rescue. Let us recognize that we have both the means and the moral obligation to lend a helping hand to Cyprus. Let us do this by casting a "yea" vote for this amendment. We are Americans, we are fortunate, but let us not be complacent and indifferent to the needs of others. I urge your support today.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL).

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very important and useful amendment and one of the things the United States can do as a positive help for Cyprus, that is making a significant contribution toward easing the refugee problem. It is an extraordinarily useful amendment. I urge my colleagues to accept it.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for offering this amendment. It seeks to do something positive about the very real and tragic human problems which now exist on the island of Cyprus. It represents a constructive effort to try to deal with these problems.

I thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment to the floor of the House and I hope the Members will support the amendment overwhelmingly.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I too commend the gentleman for his amendment. I think it would be a useful gesture toward the people on Cyprus.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct an inquiry, if the gentleman will permit me, to the Chair with respect to the rules of the House. Do I understand that if a proposed amendment is submitted formally in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to the day of debate, that insertion is adequate notice of the amendment? Is it not necessary to have copies of the amendment available at the Clerk's desk and available to the majority and minority?

The CHAIRMAN. I think the gentleman from New Jersey will recall that the purpose for the printing or the notice in advance in the RECORD was to guarantee

the person who would offer that amendment 10 minutes of debate in the event that the debate was cut off by an unanimous-consent agreement or by a motion during the actual debate in consideration of the bill. It does not obligate the Member to provide additional copies except that it is very convenient if Members would do that, and there has been some encouragement on the part of the leadership of the Congress to have each Member supply the desk and the tables on each side with copies of the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I must say there is no such copy on our side and I would hope this would be a reasonably formalized procedure.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the ranking minority member. I did speak to both the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member and I made reference to the amendment that was included in the RECORD. Heretofore, I have made as a matter of procedure and provided additional copies, but it was my judgment that since we had introduced the matter into the RECORD in sufficient time, that would be sufficient notice. It was never our intention to deprive the various sides of having copies from the maker of the amendment. In any event, if there is an offense, we apologize for it although it was not our intention to offend either side.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I raised the question a little bit ago in the debate when the gentleman from Iowa offered an amendment to reduce the amount of money to the United Nations and various agencies. A point was made in our amendment that a great amount was going to refugees. Is that not the type of situation which should be handled in the United Nations? Are we going through the United Nations or what?

Mr. BIAGGI. We are talking about a very sensitive issue. The Cyprus-Turkish problem has volatile possibilities. The Rosenthal amendments places restriction on the Secretary of State on the Nation and Turkey. The United States in the light of its own conduct in violating the Foreign Assistance Act, has not taken one positive step toward achieving a peaceful solution. In my judgment this amendment is precisely on point. In addition to dealing with the humanitarian element involved here it should have a quieting effect, on the explosive and tragic Cyprus tragedy.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

This is in the form of emergency assistance and not in terms of long-range commitments. This is different than the other refugee relief programs.

Mr. BIAGGI. That is what the amendment specifies.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. There was \$10.5 million used: \$4.6 million from the contingency fund and \$5.9 million from the special authority in the continuing resolution. Now, additional \$10 million is expected to be needed on Cyprus during the period of the next 3 or 4 months.

I just want to say, I congratulate the gentleman from New York for this amendment and I intend to support his amendment.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIAGGI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. ROSENTHAL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman and support his amendment.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I would like to point out, and I hope I have the attention of the author of the amendment, I would like to point out the situation on the island of Cyprus. There are approximately 200,000 refugees. Of these 200,000 refugees, almost all are Greek Cypriots who basically cannot return to their home, because of the occupation by Turkish forces.

I would like to have the author clarify a point for us: Is this amendment directed at the section of the bill which provides for famine or disaster relief? I am assuming it is the gentleman's thought that the appropriate officials and structure within the AID Agency would directly administer these additional funds, since obviously these funds are not to be channeled through, as I read the amendment and the act, would not be channeled through either the U.N. refugee program or any other multilateral programs.

Mr. BIAGGI. This is correct.

Mr. DERWINSKI. This would be a 1-year authorization that the gentleman is proposing?

Mr. BIAGGI. Yes; it is emergency aid for 1 year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the next to the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, how much money is involved in this request to bring a new set of refugees under the tender care of the taxpayers of this country? How much is the gentleman asking?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. \$25 million.

Mr. GROSS. \$25 million?

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any way, since there is more money going to Israel than to any other country in the world in this bill; is there any way to get the money out of those funds for Israel and give it to Cyprus?

Mr. MORGAN. I am afraid not, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS). This money is already committed in title I.

H 11622

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 11, 1974

Mr. GROSS. That is where we get into difficulty.

I would be most happy to offer an amendment to take something off Israel, if their spokesmen for this bill are so hot for taking on the support of more refugees throughout the world. The taxpayers of this country did not create this refugee problem.

We have had the Palestinian refugees on our hands for more years than I can remember and it has cost us hundreds of millions. Now, here we are embarking upon the care of more refugees and at a cost of \$25 million.

Where in the name of high heaven is it proposed to get the money to take care of refugees all over this world? It apparently is easy for some people here today to continue this business of sticking our long noses into the affairs of other nations all over the world. It has cost the citizens of this country \$260 billion.

I do not know what you tell your taxpayers when you go home. I had hoped that in the election campaign this fall that the public would tell Members of the House that they are sick and tired of inflation rocketing living costs, debt, and the way their money was being spent abroad. Apparently, the public did not speak very loudly to some of you or you were not listening—one or the other.

Whatever the merit or demerit of this amendment it saddles another \$25 million on the taxpayers of this country. You who vote for this amendment and the bill ought to be ashamed that you have added to the debt, deficit, and inflation that is tearing down this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHN L. BURTON

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHN L. BURTON: Page 23, line 13, insert immediately after "unless" the following: "and until".

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am offering this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOLTZMAN) and myself in connection with discussions with the gentleman from California (Mr. RYAN) whose language is being awarded.

This language was shown to the ranking minority Member by the gentleman from New York and was discussed with the chairman of the full committee, and also with the subcommittee chairman who deals with the subject matter. It is my understanding that there was no controversy concerning the amendment; that it fit in with the intent of the committee's language.

I hope I am correct.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman consulted the chairman of the appropriate Armed Services Subcommittee. He has no objection to the

amendment. As far as our part of the committee is concerned, speaking for my own side, I have no objection.

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask an "aye" vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHN L. BURTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHBROOK

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHBROOK: Page 17: Strike lines 8-14 and renumber following sections accordingly.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would leave the present prohibitions in effect against furnishing assistance to countries trading with North Vietnam. The committee's bill would authorize the President to waive prohibitions if such waiver is in the national interest.

I do not think that this is the time to start loosening up on prohibitions that effect North Vietnam.

Looking at one issue alone—without even discussing the thousands of North Vietnamese Paris accord violations against South Vietnam—there is abundant reason to not change the present statute. The issue that I am speaking about is American MIA's and American men killed in action.

American families do not know what has happened to their loved ones because the Vietnamese Communists refuse to carry out their agreements made with the United States. The Paris accords which both the United States and North Vietnam signed were clear as to the responsibilities of each side. Article 8, paragraph (b) states:

The parties shall help each other to get information about those military personnel and foreign civilians of the parties missing in action, to determine the location and take care of the graves of the dead so as to facilitate the exhumation and repatriation of the remains, and to take any such other measures as may be required to get information about those still considered missing in action.

The responsibility of the North Vietnamese to aid American efforts in this regard is clear. In the supplemental agreements of June 13, 1973, article 8, paragraph (b) was reemphasized.

The record of the North Vietnamese is also clear. They have been consistently opposing American efforts to gain information. Last December 15 an American without weapons who was searching for bodies of American men was killed by the Communists.

I urge the retention of the language presently in the statute by the passage of my amendment.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I would like to join with the gentleman in his sponsorship and support of this amendment. I opposed the amendment in the bill. That was not the language we were trying to change. The amendment is not in the bill, the amendment in committee which I opposed.

I feel it is entirely inappropriate at this time, when we still do not know the fate of the missing in action men. That is tragic enough, but what is more tragic is that we are not able to look at the sites of known airplane crashes.

I feel this would be adding insult to injury, and for that reason I strongly support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the difficulty in voting on bills such as this one is that your vote is bound to be misinterpreted. I intend to vote "no" on this bill because I am convinced, after listening to hours of testimony in the Foreign Affairs Committee, that on the whole, this is a bad bill. Not that there are not some good things in the bill—I completely agree, and strongly support for example, the need to provide assistance to Israel. Yet even on this issue the bill is deficient, since the aid authorization is counterbalanced by commitments to Egypt and Syria. Nor is this the only contradiction in the bill. Many of my colleagues have already pointed out areas where we are reversing U.S. policy.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is ridiculous. And I resent being forced to accept something bad in order to provide something good. If the Egyptian example were the only one, I could still probably vote for the bill. But it is not. And the bad, believe me, far outweighs the good.

If we wish to help our friends, and I think we should, then let us pass a bill which does just that. Not one which gives them something with one hand, and their enemies something with the other. And certainly not one which has a price tag so large in a time when our taxpayers are being asked to do so much.

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio. First of all, I want to stress the fact that all this amendment does is to give the President the authority to waive the restriction in the act, if he deems that to be in the national interest, to give him that authority and not to tie his hands.

The fact of the matter is that this restriction has been in the act for a long time and no one can tell us it has done the slightest bit of good, so far as influencing North Vietnam's policies are concerned. It has not had a particle of influence on North Vietnam. What it has done is cause us to be unable to carry out useful relations with one country, a country in Africa, which today is leaning toward the Soviet Union because we have been unable to give to that country any of the kind of assistance that we give other countries in Africa. That country is Somalia. Somalia has ships, which carry its flag, but which it does

not control, and some of those ships go to North Vietnam.

The restriction in the act is so broad it covers not only trade with North Vietnam but prohibits aid to any country which has ships under its registry going to North Vietnam. So here we have a wholly unintended effect of this amendment which prevents us from trying to offset Soviet influence in a small, relatively poor country in East Africa, in the misguided view that somehow or another this is going to hurt North Vietnam. The prohibition has affected, so far as I know, only that one country.

The committee felt the restriction was outdated but was perfectly willing to leave it to the President to decide whether or not in the national interest the waiver should be extended.

I say this without the slightest intention of defending the performance of the North Vietnamese Government in the matter of the MIA's. But that government would not be the slightest bit affected, whether this amendment carries or whether it does not.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out, since the gentleman from New York who is opposing the amendment has very properly raised the question of Somalia and its flags of convenience, that we should keep in mind that Somalia, in its overall conduct of foreign policy, is at best one of the least responsible of the family of nations. It is carrying on a guerrilla war in Ethiopia; it is known for its very militant support of terrorist activities; it lends a lot of vocal support to groups like the PLO; and it has a naval base which the Soviets use with great frequency.

I would think that although there may be arguments against the Ashbrook amendment, rising to challenge that amendment in the name of Somalia is hardly the best argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANGEL: Page 19, after line 9, insert the following new section.

CONTROL OF TURKISH OPIUM

Sec. 23. Section 620 or the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(Z) All assistance under this Act and all sales and guarantees of such sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act shall be suspended on the date of enactment of this subsection. The Provisions of this subsection shall cease to apply when the President certifies to the Congress that the Government of Turkey is implementing effective controls to prevent opium grown in Turkey from illegally reaching the United States, either directly or indirectly."

Renumber sections 23 through 34 as sections 24 through 35, respectively.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the support of my colleagues to cut off aid to the Government of Turkey until the President of the United States can tell this U.S. Congress that Turkey has undertaken controls that will prevent their opium from poisoning our people here in the United States.

On June 30, 1971 when the Government of Turkey entered into agreement with the United States to ban the production of opium and we agreed to provide \$36 million to assist them in this transition, the Turkish Prime Minister said—"that it was impossible for his government to effectively control the diversion of opium from his country."

He indicated that poppies are planted in only one corner of cropfields in Turkey. That to oversee the production of opium it would require 10 times the manpower of the areas to be farmed—that the situation was impossible to control.

Since this ban, our Drug Enforcement Administration has reported a drastic reduction in the quality and quantity of heroin available on our streets as well as our military installations. In New York City alone where 60 percent of all crimes were attributed to drug addicts trying to support their habit, the Director of the addict rehabilitation program has reported a reduction in deaths due to overdose, a reduction in crime and a reduction of addicts crowding our criminal court calendars and our penal institutions.

Former President Nixon reported—that in our war against narcotics, we had "turned the corner." Now we find that for purely political reasons, the Government of Turkey has announced and indeed has started the resumption of poppy growth in their country.

They have made this decision in violation of an existing agreement between our countries, and in complete disregard of the pleas of the United Nation, the request of our State Department and the threats of this Congress.

The real crime, however, is the fraud being perpetrated on this and other countries by the United Nations.

After failing to persuade the Government of Turkey not to remove the ban against opium production, they have turned around and lauded Turkey for the safeguards they have promised to undertake to avoid diversion. This, ladies and gentlemen, is an insult to this Congress and the American people.

THERE ARE NO SAFEGUARDS

The Turkish Government claims that instead of the farmers lancing the poppy bulk to allow the opium producing sap to be scraped—they will start the so-called straw process, which provides for the sale of the entire plant—after the removal of the poppy seeds for home consumption.

No one in our State Department, or in the United Nations for that matter, can tell this Congress how we can control the scraping of opium sap by these farmers and at the same time allow them the

opportunity to break the pod, remove the seeds and then sell the opium filled plant for legal use.

To this day—the Turkish Government has no purchasers for their straw but tells the United Nations that they will buy the straw themselves until such time as they build a multimillion dollar opium producing factory and you know where they expect to get the money for their factory, yes, from this Congress or through our taxpayers' moneys, through the United Nations.

And once we go along with the resumption of cultivation of poppies in Turkey and build this factory for them, forget forever the possibility of renewing the ban, no matter how much diversion they have, because they will need to grow poppies in order to support the factory.

Turkey has no more of a capability to control poppy growth now than they did when they imposed the ban. In fact, the situation is even more difficult because at the time of the ban there were only four provinces where farmers were allowed to grow poppies and today since the removal of the ban, we have under cultivation an area more than three times greater than before.

Expanding greatly the area to be policed over what the Prime Minister said was impossible to control for the drastically smaller area.

Our Ambassador to the United Nations and our State Department tell us to give them a chance and if in fact there is diversion, then the United Nations will react.

I am telling you that then it will be too late. The Drug Enforcement Administration estimates a 10 to 30 percent increase in heroin directly attributable to the fall production of poppies.

We know where we have been and what we have been through. Eighty percent of all available heroin before the ban was attributed to the Turkish opium production. Crime and addiction was destroying our cities and suburbs, our schools and our Armed Forces, our children and our Nation. Why should we be asked to wait until the epidemic is reactivated, and our Government experts say it will. The Government of Turkey said the ban was adversely affecting the welfare of their farmers. Poppycrack, the Turkish farmers represent only one-quarter of 1 percent of their population and the income produced is far less than 1 percent of their gross national product. If the Government of Turkey wanted to assist their farmers, why do we still have unspent \$20 million of the \$37 million that we allocated for the farmers' benefit? If this amendment fails and the crop is harvested we can expect that 50 percent of the expanded crop will be diverted to the illicit trafficking. A kilo of opium in Turkey is worth only \$220 but that opium converted to heroin brings \$240,000 on our urban streets. If this amendment fails the Turkish Government will ask us for money, for technical assistance, for planes and factory, and if we can not and will not supply them they would say that the diversion is our problem because there are no addicts in Turkey. The Drug Enforcement Ad-

ministration has informed me that they will face a serious budget deficit; narcotics agents both here and abroad have been drastically cut back but as in the best of times they cannot protect us from the present threat. In 1973 we lost 3,583 lives in this country due to overdoses of heroin, more than 10 times the amount of lives which were lost during the hostilities in Southeast Asia in the least year of the war. Let me say enough.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

I consider it imperative upon this Nation to cut off all economic and military aid to Turkey until we receive explicit assurances from the Turkish Government that the production of the deadly opium poppy will not be resumed.

There has been some discussion recently over the Turkish Government's announcement that they had agreed informally with the United States to change their methods of opium production to the "straw method" thus reducing the risk of renewed production of heroin.

I felt the action taken by Turkey was far from adequate. We do not need maybe's in this situation, we need clear and explicit assurances from the Government of Turkey that they will reverse their decision of several months ago and terminate all opium production. Until we get that guarantee, the course of action should be as is proposed in this amendment, a cutoff of all economic and military aid.

In 1971, I introduced similar legislation which led to the ban on opium production which was in effect until several months ago. The results of this ban were dramatic as the numbers of heroin addicts were reduced by as much as 60 percent in the 2½ years the ban was in effect.

We must prevent the evil needles filled within heroin from entering the veins of the young in our society. We must eliminate the problem by eliminating the source. Turkey needs our assistance for their economic security. Therefore let us deal from a position of strength by cutting off this valuable aid. A vote for this amendment today may save the life of an American tomorrow.

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York.

I want to express my support for the amendment now being offered which seeks to cut off all aid to Turkey until the President makes clear to the Congress that the Government of Turkey is undertaking effective controls to prevent opium grown in that nation from illegally reaching the United States.

The problem of drug addiction is a serious one today. It has spread from the ghettos to the suburbs; among its users are high school and college students. Those of us who saw the devastating consequences it had in the ghettos years ago spoke out and demanded that something be done to cope with it. Now that it has hit the middle class, many feel it is a problem which must be reckoned with.

In 1972, the Turkish Government imposed a ban on opium poppy production and the result was a reduction in the number of heroin addicts in the United States by more than 60 percent. To promote that ban the U.S. Government gave over \$35 million in assistance to Turkey in order to compensate that country's farmers for its losses and to aid them in developing alternative crops.

However, Turkey has since lifted its ban on opium production and the outlook is now that the drug will once again freely flow into this country making its way into the veins of these addicts and taking a number of lives which could have been saved. We can prevent this catastrophe from happening by passing this amendment. It is time that our Government stand up and tell Turkey we mean to put an end to this matter. It is the only human step to take to end this crisis.

(Mr. CLAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk reread the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am a bit disturbed about the sentence that says:

All assistance under this Act and all sales and guarantees of such sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act shall be suspended on the date of enactment of this subsection.

To me this would give Turkey a complete veto over every foreign aid program in any country receiving assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I am sure the gentleman from New York did not mean it to be that way, but the way the amendment is worded, it does give Turkey a complete veto over U.S. programs in some 60-odd countries.

Mr. RANGEL. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, that was not the intention of the author of this amendment, and that is the language that had been approved by the Parliamentarian, and it is because of the failure of Turkey to follow out the legal procedure that had been outlined as to the growing and handling of the opium poppies, and this amendment is designed only to deal with Turkey.

The Parliamentarian had advised me and my office that this language would suffice to do that.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I feel the language gives Turkey a complete veto over every part of the aid program. If Turkey does not comply with the gentleman's amendment, that every pro-

gram funded in this bill would be suspended.

Mr. RANGEL. I would like to report to the Chair that I am certain that the intent of the amendment is well established and spread out over the legislative record. I am confident that if this amendment is successful in passing, that it will be certain that the will of this House as well as that of the Senate will prevail.

Mr. MORGAN. The only way that I see that aid could be resumed is through certification, in the gentleman's language.

Mr. RANGEL. This is only as it relates to the Government of Turkey.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think the problem the Chairman is having is in the first sentence, the first operative sentence of the amendment, where Turkey is not mentioned. The amendment says:

All assistance under this Act and all sales and guarantees of such sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act shall be suspended on the date of enactment of this subsection.

It makes no reference at all to Turkey.

Mr. RANGEL. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, that the language of the amendment be changed to specify Turkey.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from New York that the gentleman offer amendments in writing to the language, as has been indicated, in the original amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, if I might suggest this procedure, and perhaps the gentleman from New York would agree, we have another amendment to section 3, and perhaps the gentleman from New York can withdraw his amendment and then reoffer the amendment.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY Mr. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: Page 24, strike out lines 12 through 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 29. No funds provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and no credit sales or guarantees under the Foreign Military Sales Act shall be available for India."

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple, and I believe both sides of the aisle have been provided with copies. It simply denies any further aid to India. There is \$50 million in the bill for India for assorted purposes including fertilizer.

About 2 years ago—perhaps it was 3—India told us to pack up and get out. They curtly informed us they did not need our foreign aid. And we packed up most of our missions and got out of India. India is now spending its money

on nuclear weapons and various other enterprises. There is no reason in the world why we should give \$50 million to India since they invited us to get out, lock, stock, and barrel.

I seem to recall that we turned over to the Indian Government quite a complex of buildings, new buildings, that had been built for a few years ago to house our missions in that country.

I understand some of this \$50 million may be used for food and feed grains. India is feeding now about—as I said on the floor a day or two ago—2½ billion rats—r-a-t-s—that outnumber the population 4 to 1, and which consume practically all of the increase in their food production each year. Until they show a disposition to get rid of this huge population of rats, I do not know of any way by which we can feed the hungry people of India.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One of the points that the gentleman neglected to mention was the fact that just this past year Ambassador Moynihan wrote off \$2½ billion of Indian debt that was owed to the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I thought all of the Members were acquainted with that, just as we have written off millions of Israel's debt to us.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not true that India diverted for military purposes approximately the amount of money that we have given them for economic aid over the decades, and that probably no country in the world has so abused our foreign aid as India, and that very likely we are keeping alive people by the millions now so that hundreds of millions of people can die later on?

Mr. GROSS. We have written off about \$9 to \$10 billion of aid to India.

In concluding these remarks, I should like to quote a voice out of the past:

We are taxed in our bread and wine; in our income and our investments; on our land and property, not only for base creatures who do not deserve the name of men; for foreign nations who bow to us and accept our largesse and promise to assist in keeping the peace—these mendicant nations who will destroy us when we show a moment of weakness or when our treasury is bare, and surely it is becoming bare . . . were they bound to us by ties of love they would not ask for our gold . . . they hate and despise us, and who shall say we are worthy of more?

That statement might have been made here in this House of Representatives this afternoon, but it was made about 50 years before Christ by a Roman senator and statesman, Tullius Cicero, at the time the Roman Republic began its disintegration from a republic to imperialism and extinction.

I ask, will this Nation learn from history, or will it be our fate to travel the same road to extinction of this Republic?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I

make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Sixty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

The Chair announces that he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred and two Members have appeared. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pursuant to rule XXIII, clause 2, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

The Chair had recognized the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON).

[Mr. HAMILTON addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to observe that earlier this week we adopted a resolution in the House on world food problems. In that resolution, we recited the fact that the President made a commitment to increase aid to third world countries and to enable them to increase their production.

India is one of the largest areas in the world which is suffering from an inability to feed itself. The aid involved here is not for food. That is under Public Law 480.

This is what President Ford was talking about when he said we would help these countries help themselves in increasing agricultural production. Because of the monsoons which occurred last year and the high costs and shortage of fertilizer, the crop production in India has been down. They need some help.

This amount of \$50 million is extremely limited. To cut it off altogether is, in effect, to say that despite what President Ford said the other day, we do not really mean it; we are not going to give our assistance in helping increase food production.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I support the Gross amendment denying aid to India. I do so because I do not believe that we should continue to provide aid to that country so long as India is embarked on spending hundreds of millions of dollars on nuclear bomb development. It is shocking that when its own people are starving that India will use its meager resources to develop and explode atomic bombs. When India changes its priorities we can change ours and provide it with further economic aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 19; noes 41.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 159, noes 223, answered "present" 1, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 672]

AYES—159

Abdnor	Fish	O'Brien
Andrews, N.C.	Flowers	Parris
Andrews,	Flynt	Pettis
N. Dak.	Fountain	Peyser
Archer	Frey	Pike
Armstrong	Frœhlich	Poage
Ashbrook	Fuqua	Powell, Ohio
Bafalis	Gaydos	Price, Tex.
Baker	Gettys	Pritchard
Bauman	Ginn	Randall
Bevill	Goodling	Rarick
Blackburn	Gross	Roberts
Bray	Gubser	Robinson, Va.
Brinkley	Gunter	Rogers
Broomfield	Haley	Roncallo, Wyo.
Brown, Mich.	Hanrahan	Roush
Broyhill, N.C.	Harsha	Rousselot
Broyhill, Va.	Henderson	Runnels
Burgener	Holt	Sarasin
Burke, Fla.	Huber	Satterfield
Burleson, Tex.	Hudnut	Scherle
Burlison, Mo.	Hungate	Shuster
Butler	Hunt	Sikes
Byron	Hutchinson	Skubitz
Carney, Ohio	Ichord	Snyder
Carter	Jarman	Spence
Casey, Tex.	Johnson, Calif.	Steelman
Cederberg	Jones, Tenn.	Steger, Ariz.
Chappell	Karth	Stephens
Clancy	Kazen	Stratton
Clausen,	Kemp	Stubblefield
Don H.	Ketchum	Stuckey
Clawson, Del	King	Sullivan
Cohen	Koch	Symms
Collins, Tex.	Lagomarsino	Talcott
Conlan	Landgrebe	Taylor, Mo.
Crane	Landrum	Taylor, N.C.
Daniel, Dan	Long, Md.	Thone
Daniel, Robert	Lott	Thornton
W., Jr.	Lujan	Towell, Nev.
Davis, Ga.	McCollister	Traxler
Davis, S.C.	McCormack	Vander Jagt
Denholm	Macdonald	Waggonner
Dennis	Maraziti	Walsh
Dent	Martin, N.C.	Wampler
Derwinski	Milford	Whitehurst
Devine	Miller	Wolf
Dickinson	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wyllie
Dingell	Mizell	Yatron
Dorn	Montgomery	Young, Alaska
Downing	Moorhead,	Young, Fla.
Dulski	Calif.	Young, S.C.
Duncan	Myers	Zion
Ellberg	Nichols	
Evins, Tenn.	Nix	

NOES—223

Abzug	Conte	Hammer-
Adams	Conyers	schmidt
Addabbo	Corman	Hanley
Alexander	Cotter	Hanna
Anderson,	Coughlin	Harrington
Calif.	Cronin	Hastings
Anderson, Ill.	Culver	Hechler, W. Va.
Annunzio	Daniels,	Heckler, Mass.
Ashley	Dominick V.	Heinz
Aspin	Davis, Wis.	Helstoski
Badillo	de la Garza	Hicks
Bell	Delaney	Hillis
Bennett	Dellenback	Hogan
Bergland	Dellums	Holtzman
Biaggi	Diggs	Horton
Blester	Drinan	Hosmer
Bingham	du Pont	Johnson, Pa.
Blatnik	Eckhardt	Jones, Ala.
Boggs	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, Okla.
Boland	Edwards, Calif.	Jordan
Bolling	Erlenborn	Kastenmeter
Bowen	Esch	Kluczynski
Bracemas	Evans, Colo.	Kyros
Breaux	Fascell	Latta
Breckinridge	Findley	Leggett
Brooks	Flood	Lehman
Brotzman	Foley	Lent
Brown, Calif.	Ford	Long, La.
Brown, Ohio	Forsythe	McClary
Buchanan	Fraser	McCloskey
Burke, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	McDade
Burke, Mass.	Frenzel	McEwen
Burton, John	Gibbons	McFall
Chamberlain	Gilman	McKay
Chisholm	Gonzalez	McKinney
Clark	Gray	Madden
Clay	Green, Pa.	Madigan
Cleveland	Gude	Mahon
Cochran	Guyer	Mallary
Collins, Ill.	Hamilton	Mann

Matsunaga	Rees	Steele
Mayne	Regula	Stokes
Mazzoli	Reld	Studds
Meeds	Reuss	Symington
Melcher	Rhodes	Teague
Metcalf	Riegle	Thompson, N.J.
Mezvinsky	Rinaldo	Thomson, Wis.
Michel	Robison, N.Y.	Treen
Minish	Roe	Udall
Mink	Rooney, Pa.	Ullman
Mitchell, Md.	Rose	Van Deerlin
Moakley	Rosenthal	Vander Veen
Mollohan	Rostenkowski	Vanik
Moorhead, Pa.	Roy	Veysey
Morgan	Roybal	Vigorito
Mosher	Ruppe	Waldie
Moss	Ruth	Ware
Murphy, Ill.	Ryan	Whalen
Murphy, N.Y.	St Germain	White
Murtha	Sandman	Whitten
Natcher	Sarbanes	Widnall
Nedzi	Schneebeli	Wiggins
Nelsen	Schroeder	Williams
Obey	Sebelius	Wilson, Bob
O'Neill	Selberling	Wilson,
Owens	Shipley	Charles, Tex.
Patman	Shriver	Winn
Patten	Sisk	Wright
Pepper	Slack	Wyatt
Perkins	Smith, Iowa	Wylder
Pickle	Smith, N.Y.	Yates
Preyer	Stanton,	Young, Ga.
Price, Ill.	J. William	Young, Ill.
Quie	Stanton,	Young, Tex.
Quillen	James V.	Zablocki
Railsback	Stark	
Rangel	Steed	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hinshaw

NOT VOTING—51

Arends	Griffiths	Mills
Barrett	Grover	Minshall, Ohio
Beard	Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara
Brasco	Hansen, Wash.	Passman
Burton, Phillip	Hawkins	Podell
Camp	Hays	Rodino
Carey, N.Y.	Hébert	Roncallo, N.Y.
Collier	Holfield	Rooney, N.Y.
Conable	Howard	Shoup
Danielson	Johnson, Colo.	Staggers
Donohue	Jones, N.C.	Steiger, Wis.
Eshleman	Kuykendall	Tiernan
Fisher	Litton	Wilson,
Fulton	Lukens	Charles H.,
Glaime	McSpadden	Calif.
Goldwater	Martin, Nebr.	Wyman
Grasso	Mathias, Calif.	Zwach
Green, Oreg.	Mathis, Ga.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that all of the major amendments are now out of the way. There are about four or five amendments left, so I am going to ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto cease at 7 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, printed in the Record, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

TITLE IV—FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 30. The Foreign Military Sales Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 3(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) A country shall remain ineligible in accordance with subsection (c) of this sec-

tion until such time as the President determines that such violation has ceased, that the country concerned has given assurances satisfactory to the President that such violation will not recur, and that, if such violation involved the transfer of sophisticated weapons without the consent of the President, such weapons have been returned to the country concerned."

(2) In section 24(a) and section 24(b) the parenthetical phrase in each is amended to read: "(excluding United States Government agencies other than the Federal Financing Bank)".

(3) In section 31—

(A) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out "\$325,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$405,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975"; and

(B) Subsection (b) is amended by striking out "\$730,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, of which amount not less than \$300,000,000 shall be available to Israel only" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$772,500,000 for the fiscal year 1975, of which not less than \$200,000,000 shall be made available for Israel".

(4) In section 33—

(A) subsection (a) is repealed;

(B) subsection (b) is redesignated as subsection (a); and

(c) a new subsection (b) is added as follows:

"(b) The President may waive the limitations of this section when he determines it to be important to the security of the United States and promptly so reports to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate."

(5) Section 35(b) is repealed, and section 36 is amended by inserting before subsection (c) the following new subsections:

"(a) The President shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate quarterly reports containing—

"(1) a listing of all letters of offer to sell any defense article or services under this Act, if such offer has not been accepted or canceled;

"(2) a cumulative listing of all such letters of offer to sell that have been accepted during the fiscal year in which such report is submitted;

"(3) the cumulative dollar amounts, by foreign country and international organization, of credit sales under section 23 and guaranty agreements under section 24 made before the submission of such quarterly report and during the fiscal year in which such report is submitted; and

"(4) projections of the cumulative dollar amounts, by foreign country and international organization, of credit sales under section 23 and guaranty agreements under section 24 to be made in the quarter of the fiscal year immediately following the quarter for which such report is submitted.

For each letter of offer to sell under paragraphs (1) and (2), the report shall specify (A) the foreign country or international organization to which the defense article or service is offered, (B) the dollar amount of the offer to sell under paragraph (1) or of the completed sale under paragraph (2), (C) a brief description of the defense article or service offered, (D) the United States armed force which is making the offer to sell, (E) the date of such offer, and (F) the date of any acceptance under paragraph (2).

"(b) In the case of any letter of offer to sell any defense articles or services under this Act for \$25,000,000 or more, before issuing such letter of offer the President shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a statement with respect to such offer to sell containing the information specified in sub-

paragraphs (A) through (E) in subsection (a). The letter of offer shall not be issued if the Congress, within twenty legislative days after receiving any such statement, adopts a concurrent resolution stating in effect that it objects to such proposed sale, unless the President in his statement certifies that an emergency exists which requires such sale in the national security interests of the United States."

DEFINITION OF "VALUE" FOR FOREIGN MILITARY SALES

SEC. 31. Section 8(c) of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act, and for other purposes", approved January 12, 1971 (22 U.S.C. 2321b), is amended by inserting immediately before the period the following: "except that for any excess defense article such term shall not include a value for any such article which is less than 33 1/3 percent of the amount the United States paid for such article when the United States acquired it".

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS AND MISCELLANEOUS

FEASIBILITY STUDY OF ACCESS TO RAW MATERIALS

SEC. 32. It is the sense of the Congress that open access should be assured for all nations to the world's fossil fuel, metal, and mineral resources so that such resources may be made available to all nations at a reasonable cost. For this purpose, the President shall—

(1) study the feasibility of using, through a barter arrangement or any other means, United States foreign assistance, foreign credits, or investment guaranties (through such United States Government organizations as the Agency for International Development, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and the Export-Import Bank), or international financing, to develop open access for all nations to necessary or strategic raw materials throughout the world at a reasonable cost; and

(2) submit his findings and recommendations resulting from the study under paragraph (1) to the Congress no later than March 31, 1975.

For the purposes of this section, the term "necessary or strategic raw material" includes any fossil fuels, metals, or minerals the United States requirements of which are not, or will not be in the foreseeable future, produced in the United States or located in the United States in natural form.

GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE

SEC. 33. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial", approved May 7, 1928, is amended by striking out "\$500,000" and inserting "\$2,000,000" in lieu thereof.

INVOLVEMENT OF PUERTO RICO IN THE CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

SEC. 34. (a) The President may transmit to the Caribbean Development Bank an instrument stating that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has the authority to conclude an agreement of accession with such Bank and to assume rights and obligations pursuant to such agreement. However, such agreement may only be concluded after it has been approved by the United States Secretary of State.

(b) The instrument transmitted by the President to the Caribbean Development Bank under subsection (a) shall state that the United States shall not assume any financial or other responsibility for the performance of any obligation incurred by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico pursuant to such agreement of accession or pursuant to any other aspect of its membership or participation in such Bank.

(c) Such agreement of accession shall

provide that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico may not receive from the Caribbean Development Bank any funds provided to the Bank by the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I now move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto cease at 7 o'clock. The motion was agreed to.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. What about those of us who have had amendments at the desk all day?

The CHAIRMAN. Have they been printed in the RECORD?

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. No; but I gave them to the desk today.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). If the amendments are printed in the RECORD, under the Rules of the House the proponents will be entitled to 5 minutes of debate.

Members standing at the time the motion was made will be recognized for 1 minute each.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HOLTZMAN

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. HOLTZMAN: Page 23, line 14, strike out "important to the national security" and insert in lieu thereof "vital to the national defense".

(Ms. HOLTZMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. It is designed to enlarge congressional control over the Central Intelligence Agency's non-intelligence-gathering functions.

The provisions of this bill relating to the CIA constitute a major improvement over the situation in the past. This bill permits the CIA to engage in covert activities only after the President reports about these activities to the House and Senate committees dealing with foreign affairs and the House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

Despite the improvement, I still think these provisions are seriously deficient. This bill authorizes CIA activities designed to subvert or undermine foreign governments so long as they are "important to national security." This rubric is so broad as to be almost meaningless. Thus, the President is empowered to authorize CIA actions to subvert foreign governments basically when he thinks it would be desirable. It seems to me, however, that the circumstances in which the CIA ought ever to be permitted to subvert a foreign government with which we are at peace should be very limited at best.

My amendment would permit the CIA to engage in non-intelligence-gathering activities only when such activities are "vital to our national defense." My amendment would thus limit the instances in which the CIA would run afoul of international law, and also we

would be limiting the instances in which foreign policy is in essence being created by the President, the CIA, and four committees of Congress.

I urge support of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI).

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

We have in this bill a provision restraining certain operations of the CIA to those "important to the national security" and in timely fashion they are obliged to bring to the notice of Congress any activities which the CIA may be engaged in which are important to the national security. I submit that is a very important statutory provision and a departure from what the situation is at the present time. When we speak about matters "vital to the national defense" we are then it seems to me restraining the agency from perhaps operating in antidrug programs or the agency could be prevented from conducting antiterrorist activities programs, among others. In my judgment it just is not the kind of constraint that it is desirable to apply with respect to the President and the CIA. The language offered has broad implications and should not be approved without careful and detailed consideration by appropriate committees prior to bringing the matter before the entire House under circumstances of very limited debate.

While I have a moment I would like for the purpose of clarification inquire of the chairman what his interpretation of the language in the bill relating to reporting to Congress by the CIA is, particularly as it relates to the understanding we reached with the Secretary of State and the Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman will yield, it is my belief that the amendment contained in the committee bill carries out, and provides further statutory basis for the implementation of, the understanding to which the gentleman has referred as it applies to the foreign policy-related operations of the CIA.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee adopted an amendment to bring the CIA under more effective congressional control and the author of the amendment, the gentleman from California (Mr. RYAN), is here. I yield to him to speak in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment for I think substantive reasons. This was my amendment in the committee and it was very carefully worked out. We deal here with a very sensitive area. It was my intention and the intention of the committee to try to bring the CIA under some kind of jurisdiction by the Foreign Affairs Committees because obviously the decisions of CIA have an enormous effect upon our foreign affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recog-

nizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak in opposition to the amendment. In my opinion we should have reservations about the language in the committee bill with respect to intelligence activities. And certainly we would be very unwise to change the language of "important to the national security" to "vital to national defense." This would preclude many activities which might well be needed in our own interest. I hope this amendment is soundly defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALEY yielded his time to Mr. MORGAN.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I was about to say that present language in this bill is very carefully drawn to derive the maximum amount of support from the various elements involved. If we can get this language through for those who are interested in having some kind of closer supervision for the CIA activities, this particular amendment is one which members of the committee think will pass and which we would be able to have signed. Without this particular language I think we will have serious problems with supervision of the CIA by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I am concerned about the manner in which this particular subject is approached. On the one hand we have to be careful and delicate and on the other hand we do need jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment of the gentlelady from New York because I believe that the language we have now is as strong as we can get at this particular time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I do not have an amendment, but I would like to say that I intend to vote against this legislation. I intend to vote against it for many reasons; particularly so because we now owe \$503 billion. When we started this game of Godfather to all the world, we owed \$4 billion. The interest alone on our debt is as great as the budget was in 1940. There is no way under the Sun that this Nation can possibly grow all the food for the world, provide all the guns for the world, provide all the machinery for the world, and then provide a marketplace for all the world's goods.

We are as poor as any nation we are helping, when we consider the kind of life that we have become accustomed to with our standard of living. If we really want to help some nation that is in eminent danger of collapse, one might suggest that we help the poverty-stricken country of Italy.

We sell this legislation many times

H 11628

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

December 11, 1974

with an argument that we are saving nations from communism.

Italy is on the brink of going Communist but no one in our Government seems to give it a thought.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I invite the House to reflect on the fact that we have expended at least \$260 billion on foreign aid since its inception. It seems to me that this kind of business, in terms of the condition of this country, is beyond all reason and is, in fact, financial insanity.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY OF OHIO

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARNEY of Ohio: Page 30, after line 12, insert the following new section:

TEN PERCENT REDUCTION OF EACH
AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 35. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount authorized by any amendment made by this Act and each allocation and limitation of any such authorized amount shall be reduced by ten percent.

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce each of the authorizations, allocations and limitations contained in this act by 10 percent. It would save the American taxpayers \$260 million.

In recent months, the President has emphasized one overriding economic fact which threatens every American—an escalating inflation which is sapping our economic gains and, unless controlled, will destroy our Nation's economy. The President told us that everyone has a stake in combating inflation, that the Government must curtail excessive spending, and that we in the Congress have a responsibility for staying within the Federal budget by making prudent cuts.

It seems obvious to me, Mr. Chairman, that the one area where the most sensible and justifiable cuts can be made is in the area of foreign aid.

From 1945 through 1973, we spent \$185 billion of the taxpayers' money to help other nations—first to rehabilitate those ravaged by the war, then to help others withstand Communist subversion and aggression, and finally to help newly-independent nations find their place in the Sun, or at least provide the necessities of life for their own peoples.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for us to exercise prudence in our overseas giving, and prudence demands that foreign aid be cut to the bare essentials. We must not be wasteful of our own substance when our own people stand in need.

This bill authorizes \$2.6 billion in foreign aid during fiscal year 1975. While the Foreign Affairs Committee has authorized \$600 million less than the administration requested. This bill still provides \$746.3 million more than Congress appropriated for the same aid programs last year.

Furthermore, despite mass starvation in Africa, Bangladesh, and other parts of the world, this foreign aid bill is heavily-weighted with military assistance: \$1.15 billion of the \$2.6 billion authorized in this bill goes directly to military assistance, \$585 million is for military-related "Security Supporting Assistance" programs, and \$573 million is for assistance to our allies in South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

Mr. Chairman, these military assistance programs do not increase the security of the countries that receive such assistance, and they do not increase our own national security. In fact, they have the opposite effect. Look at India and Pakistan; look at Greece and Turkey. These countries used American military aid against each other.

Mr. Chairman, we could phase out our military aid over a short period, say 3 years, use a percentage of that money and additional cuts in economic aid to build up our own economy here at home. The 10-percent, across-the-board cut in foreign assistance programs which I propose will demonstrate that we are serious about reducing wasteful and unnecessary Federal Government spending.

Mr. Chairman, what was wrong with our foreign aid programs 10 years ago is wrong with our foreign aid programs today. The countries that were supposed to be eliminated from our foreign aid lists are still on them; programs are still being overfunded; inefficient personnel are making the same enormous mistakes; uncommitted and undisbursed carry-over funds are as large as ever; speculation in aid goods is as rife as ever; ineffective planning for too many projects is as sloppy as ever; recipient countries are being played off against each other; ability to repay is not considered.

All too often our foreign aid benefits only the ruling class and never reaches the millions of poor people for whom it was intended. One wonders whether our aid programs exist for the benefit of the people in the recipient nations or solely for the benefit of the overblown bureaucracy that administers these programs. How often has our foreign aid been used by other nations to compete against our own American workers and American businesses?

Clearly, America can no longer afford a policy of foreign aid business-as-usual. The time has come for Congress to make further cuts in foreign aid spending and to divert this money to the transportation, health, housing, and education of our own people here at home. Let us show the American people that their Government is genuinely concerned about their welfare rather than the welfare of some foreign dictator.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in opposition to the amendment, because I count the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY) a very close friend; however, I must submit that this is not a responsible amendment. The

committee has already cut \$609 million from the bill and with these cuts selectively made, it is much more responsible than it was when submitted by the executive branch.

This bill is a bill to help the developing countries to help themselves to grow the necessary food they are in such dire need of, if we are, indeed, going to fulfill the commitments we have made, we must not vote for this amendment.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, I think it is a very responsible amendment for the taxpayers of the United States.

The Foreign Assistance Act authorizes a 39 percent increase over last year's expenditures. For years and years, we somehow labored under the false notion that friends and allies could somehow be bought on these massive foreign aid giveaways. I think the gentleman from Ohio is absolutely right in offering this amendment, in fact, I have a similar amendment at the desk that I will now not offer.

I have just a little additional note on what foreign aid has done for us. Since 1955, 21 wars have been fought by the governments around the world. In nine of these wars, the United States supported one of the opposing sides, but in the other 12, the United States financed and supported both sides. The cost of this kind of activity, when all things are considered, probably is in the neighborhood of \$200 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very good amendment, and I urge its passage.

(Mr. SYMMS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Should this amendment pass, it will be cutting our assistance to Israel and undercutting the commitment made by Secretary Kissinger in the Middle East which is a part of the diplomacy he is carrying on there. It will be cutting even more from the already reduced amount for food assistance, which represents a pledge made both by President Ford and Secretary Kissinger, both here and in Rome.

Cutting indiscriminately will not solve some of the problems we have. It is no substitute for specific cuts. It will weigh very heavily in places such as Israel.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CARNEY).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANGEL: Page 19, after line 9, insert the following new section.

CONTROL OF TURKISH OPIUM

SEC. 23. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(8) All assistance under this Act with respect to the Government of Turkey and all sales and guarantees of such sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act with respect to the Government of Turkey shall be suspended

on the date of enactment of this subsection. The Provisions of this subsection shall cease to apply when the President certifies to the Congress that the Government of Turkey is implementing effective controls to prevent opium grown in Turkey from illegally reaching the United States, either directly or indirectly."

Renumber sections 23 through 34 as sections 24 through 35, respectively.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, in 1971 the Turkish Government entered into an agreement with the United States to ban the growth of opium. They have now violated that agreement. They have rejected the pleas of the United Nations; rejected the pleas of our State Department and have also rejected the pleas of this Congress.

Now, the Drug Enforcement Administration says that as a result of this, we can expect from a 10- to 30-percent increase in opium on our streets of New York. There are no safeguards to the resumption of opium in this country, and it seems to me that we have gone through enough in crime and loss of life in the military and in the cities.

Now is the time for us to stand up and be included and tell the Turkish Government that until our President can certify that they have some safeguards to protect us, then we should cut off aid to the Government of Turkey.

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, our committee has spent considerable time on the issue of narcotics.

We were the first to propose language—which is now law—directing that aid be cut off from countries which refuse to cooperate in putting an end to illegal traffic in narcotics.

Our special subcommittee did very thorough investigative work in this field.

Our committee is deeply concerned about illegal trade in narcotics, and we have authorized substantial funds to help in the fight against such trade.

For these reasons, I believe we should wait and negotiate with the Turks, not try to put permanent blocks in the way of mutual cooperation.

May I explain a bit more to the Members: I supported the resolution which expressed the sense of Congress to cut off aid to Turkey if they went back to opium poppy production. The problem we have under the language of this amendment is that it tells the President to cut off aid unless the Government of Turkey is implementing effective controls to prevent opium grown in Turkey from illegally reaching the United States, either directly or indirectly.

The real problem is there is not a government in Turkey with which one could effectively negotiate. They have a caretaker government. They cannot make a serious decision of any kind; and, as a result, one cannot implement the intent of Congress either with this amendment or as it affects Cyprus. The Government

of Turkey is a day-to-day operation. Until they resolve their present problems, the President cannot negotiate, even if they have intentions of good faith, because they are not in a position to do anything with us.

There are enough other safeguards, enough other bills in this Congress, and I urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LONG OF MARYLAND

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LONG of Maryland: Page 25, strike out line 19 down through line 3 on page 26.

Page 26, line 4, strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)" in lieu thereof.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I hope people are listening here tonight as the purpose of my amendment is very important.

As the foreign military sales law now reads, there is a ceiling of \$150 million on military aid, credit sales, and guarantees to Latin America. This bill would eliminate this ceiling and eliminate all restrictions on unlimited sales. Any President could sell any amount of military equipment he wanted in Latin America, a desperately poor continent, where there is a tremendous need for those countries to try to educate their people and improve their housing, health, and other such needs. Yet, this bill would encourage the arming of one dictator after another against the country next door.

What my amendment does is to reestablish the \$150 million ceiling that has prevailed heretofore. I think that is reasonable, and I hope very much my amendment will be agreed to. Without my amendment the Congress would have no controls in vital foreign policy decisions. All this bill does is to promote a few businesses on the grounds we would lose in an arms competition with the French and other sellers. Yet the United States sells three times the weapons worldwide than the nearest European competitor! Why does this bill remove the ceiling without offering any foreign policy rationale? Increased sales of sophisticated weapons clearly will affect arms races—and U.S. foreign policy.

This amendment is for the convenience of a few—unnamed—U.S. arms exporters.

If it is true that previous congressional restrictions on the sales of sophisticated weapons to Latin America have lost some U.S. firms some business, this is less significant than foreign policy considerations and of U.S. interests in avoiding destructive arms races.

The French, which have sold some Mirage jets to Latin America, will only export \$3 billion in U.S. dollar terms worldwide in 1974, compared with over

\$9 billion for the United States, according to French Government figures.

U.S. Government figures show that the United States has long been the biggest arms exporter. Between 1961 and 1971: first, the United States exported \$22.7 billion in arms; second, the French and British each exported \$1.6 billion; and third, the Soviets exported \$14.7 billion.

The interest terms for the \$200 million in credits the administration wants to approve in this bill are only about 7½ percent over a 10-year repayment period. Chile's repayment has been rescheduled. Brazil's interest rates between 1964 and 1973 were from about 3 percent to about 6 percent. This is a poor deal for the U.S. taxpayer.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. What it does is simply make it possible for Latin American governments to buy their weapons from the Russians, from the French, from the British, from the Germans, from everybody but the United States.

I can tell the Members we have monitored this program very carefully. We have found that the Pentagon acted very responsibly with respect to aid. We feel that instead of being in sixth place in the marketplace, we are having to fight to stay in second or third. We want to give our people a reasonable opportunity. We believe they have acted responsibly in the past, and there is no reason to reimpose these shackling ceilings at this time on our Department of Defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. LONG).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER: Page 28, strike out line 12 down through line 10 on page 29, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

EXCHANGES OF NECESSARY OR STRATEGIC
RAW MATERIALS

SEC. 28. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 661. Exchanges of Certain Materials—
(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever the President determines it is in the United States national interest, he shall furnish assistance under this Act or shall furnish defense articles or services under the Foreign Military Sales Act pursuant to an agreement with the recipient of such assistance, articles, or services which provides that such recipient may only obtain such assistance, articles, or services in exchange for any necessary or strategic raw material controlled by such recipient. For the purposes of this section, the term 'necessary or strategic raw material' includes

December 11, 1974.

H 11630

petroleum, other fossil fuels, metals, minerals, or any other natural substance which the President determines is in short supply in the United States.

"(b) The President shall allocate any necessary or strategic raw material transferred to the United States under this section to any appropriate agency of the United States Government for stockpiling, sale, transfer, disposal, or any other purpose authorized by law.

"(c) Funds received from any disposal of materials under subsection (b) shall be deposited as miscellaneous receipts in the United States Treasury."

(Mr. MILLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that was offered this afternoon. It has a substantive change in it. The change is this: that the funds that would be received from any disposal of materials under subsection (b), instead of going back to the agency, would go into the United States Treasury.

What this amendment does is to allow us to barter our foreign assistance and get something in return in this country for the food, fiber, and technology that we are sending to more than 100 countries around the world. We are in need of strategic metals in order to keep our highly industrialized nation going. It is vitally important that we receive something in return for the foreign assistance that we are giving away. We have \$2.6 billion in the bill today.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members will support the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) which would permit the United States to enter into exchange or barter arrangements with recipients or prospective recipients of foreign aid provided by this country.

I support this amendment for two reasons. First of all, I believe it makes the bill more politically palatable to our constituents; second, I believe it provides our Government with more options and greater flexibility than the existing language of the bill which provides for a study of this issue to be submitted to the Congress no later than March 31 of next year.

Every Member of this body is aware of the fact that the constituency for foreign aid is small, and has been rapidly declining, not only in our districts but also right here in the Congress. The people of this Nation are legitimately concerned that we have accrued massive budget deficits in recent years. They are legitimately concerned that pressing domestic needs go unmet due to a lack of Federal funds to ameliorate these needs. More specifically, they are concerned that

there are few tangible benefits resulting from the foreign aid program.

We in the Congress have the responsibility to seek new ways to derive benefits from our foreign aid programs, and to accomplish this goal in such a way that it is mutually beneficial to all countries involved.

This amendment would simply open the door to the consideration of barter arrangements by providing our Government with the authority to negotiate for such goals.

In other words, I interpret this amendment in its most limited sense. The amendment specifically states that such barter arrangements are to be pursued "whenever it is in the national interest" and "to the maximum extent practicable." Those phrases imply, as I believe they must, that these arrangements would be considered on a case-by-case basis in accord with our needs, at a particular point in time for a particular strategic raw material, and in conjunction with all other relevant factors such as the effect such an arrangement would have on the prevailing market system, U.S. companies and their trade relations with these and other countries, and a host of other factors.

The language presently in the bill provides for a 3-month study of this concept. While such a study could provide broad guidelines which could be useful, I see no reason for delay, and I can think of no better way of gaining information on this subject than for us to jump in and try it out. Certainly no harm could come from a responsibly administered exploration of the possibilities—and the benefits—of such a program.

Consequently, I suggest that it is preferable to provide the President with the authority to enter into such arrangements and, permit such arrangements to be considered, as they would be anyway, on a case-by-case basis.

Finally, I would like to address myself to some of the concerns expressed by members of the Foreign Affairs Committee during consideration of Mr. MILLER's proposal. This amendment does not include quid pro quo language, and I would not support it if it did. Such language would imply that we were setting up a program for mutual aid between the poor and the wealthy in the name of foreign assistance from our country to poorer nations. However, it does permit this Nation to enter into barter arrangements with another nation which may be poor in health and population services, and underdeveloped in transportation, communication, and technical expertise, but rich in a resource or in resources which we need. Moreover, as I read the language of this amendment, it would permit us to provide aid in exchange not only for the direct transfer of resources but also for a guarantee of the purchase of certain resources on a preferred basis.

In other words, I see this amendment as providing a negotiating tool—an expression of the intention and the intent of the Congress to receive a "fair deal" from aid recipients who are in a position to provide it. I think that it is useful, at

this juncture, to point out that much of our experience abroad in recent years has demonstrated to us that we are far from having the answers to the world's problems in general and to other countries in particular. Having had the humility to admit this to ourselves, we might take the next logical step, which is recognizing that other countries may well be able to assist us. This amendment provides a vehicle for such an exchange of assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the Members' attention the fact that, at the present time, this country is importing 96 percent of our aluminum, 85 percent of our asbestos, 77 percent of our tin, 52 percent of our zinc, 44 percent of our tungsten, 17 percent of our platinum, 74 percent of our nickel, 95 percent of our manganese, 26 percent of our lead, and 98 percent of our cobalt. In all, we import \$19 billion and export \$11 billion worth of raw materials annually, with the obvious adverse impact on our balance of payments.

For example, imports supplied 100 percent of U.S. 1973 demand for chromium, which is supplied by two major U.S. aid recipients—Turkey and the Philippines. We also imported 100 percent of our demand for the minerals strontium, cobalt, tantalum, and columbium, which are produced by combinations of aid recipients ranging from Brazil and Mexico to Canada and from Norway and Finland to Nigeria. All of these countries do now or have received U.S. aid.

More importantly, perhaps, is the fact that by the year 2000, according to the Brookings Institution, we will be totally dependent on foreign sources for 12 of the 13 basic raw materials used by our industries.

I urge the Members to support this worthwhile amendment by Congressman MILLER.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise, somewhat reluctantly, in opposition to this amendment.

I wish to point out that the committee this afternoon defeated a similar amendment. The Committee on Foreign Affairs also defeated an amendment of this nature in our deliberations. Instead, we directed a study; and as the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN), pointed out earlier today, we will have a report on this study within the next few months.

Mr. Chairman, since this amendment has already been defeated once before, I urge its defeat again.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 136, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 673]

AYES—244

Abdnor
Adams
Alexander
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Archer
Ashbrook
Bafalis
Baker
Bauman
Beard
Bennett
Bevill
Blaggi
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Bowen
Breaux
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burgener
Burke, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Butler
Byron
Carney, Ohio
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Chappell
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collins, Tex.
Conlan
Conte
Coughlin
Crane
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert
W. Jr.
Daniels
Dominick V.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
de la Garza
Delaney
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Esch
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Fountain
Frenzel
Frey
Froehlich
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gettys

Gilman
Ginn
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gunter
Guyer
Haley
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hanrahan
Harsha
Hastings
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Heinz
Henderson
Hillis
Hinshaw
Hogan
Holt
Horton
Huber
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Kemp
Ketchum
King
Koch
Kyros
Lagomarsino
Landgrebe
Landrum
Latta
Leggett
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lott
Lujan
McCollister
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McKinney
Madigan
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathis, Ga.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Melcher
Milford
Miller
Minish
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead,
Calif.
Moorhead, Pa.
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Brien
Owens
Pettis
Peysers
Pike

Poage
Preyer
Price, Tex.
Quile
Quillen
Randall
Regula
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Roe
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Sandman
Sarasin
Satterfield
Scherle
Schneebeli
Sebelius
Shipley
Shoup
Shuster
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Steele
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Symms
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Towell, Nev.
Traxler
Treen
Ullman
Veysey
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Ware
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wildnall
Wiggins
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wydlar
Wyllie
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Young, Ill.
Young, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zion
Zwack

NOES—136

Abzug
Addabbo
Anderson,
Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Annunzio
Armstrong
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Bell
Bergland
Blester
Bingham
Boland
Bolling

Brademas
Bray
Breckinridge
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Burke, Calif.
Burton, John
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chisholm
Clark
Clay
Collins, Ill.
Conyers
Corman
Cotter

Culver
Danielson
Dellenback
Dellums
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Drinan
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Flood
Ford

Forsythe
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green, Pa.
Gude
Hamilton
Hanna
Harrington
Hawkins
Helstoski
Hicks
Holtzman
Hosmer
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Lehman
McClory
McCloskey
McFall
McKay
Maddison
Mahon
Mallory
Meeds
Metcalfe

Mezvisinsky
Michel
Mink
Mitchell, Md.
Moakley
Morgan
Murphy, N.Y.
Murtha
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Obey
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Price, Ill.
Pritchard
Rallsback
Rangel
Reid
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Robison, N.Y.
Roncallo, Wyo.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roybal

Ryan
St Germain
Sarbanes
Schroeder
Seiberling
Sisk
Stanton,
J. William
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Talcott
Thompson, N.J.
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Whalen
Williams
Wilson,
Charles H.,
Calif.
Wilson,
Charles, Tex.
Wyatt
Yates
Young, Ga.
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—54

Arends
Barrett
Brasco
Burke, Fla.
Burton, Phillip
Camp
Carey, N.Y.
Clancy
Collier
Conable
Davis, Wis.
Eshleman
Fish
Fisher
Gialmo
Goldwater
Goodling
Grasso
Gray

Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hays
Hébert
Hollifield
Howard
Johnson, Colo.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Klucynski
Kuykendall
Lent
Litton
Luken
McSpadden
Mathias, Calif.
Mills

Minshall, Ohio
O'Hara
Parris
Passman
Podell
Powell, Ohio
Rarick
Rees
Rodino
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, N.Y.
Shriver
Stanton,
James V.
Teague
Ternan
Wyman

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will those Members who have amendments at the desk have a minute for time to present their amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. Those Members who have amendments at the desk may present their amendments. Those who have amendments which were printed in the RECORD will be recognized for 5 minutes in support of their amendments.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHBROOK

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHBROOK:
I move to strike on page 13, line 21 the figure
"\$154,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof
"\$139,000,000."

(Mr. ASHBROOK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment's thrust is very simple. It will reduce by 10 percent the funds available under this section and thereby bring total U.S. contributions to the U.N. closer to that 25-percent figure which has been supported by so many in this body. If I had my way, I would reduce it to a nominal \$1,000,000, but I know that is not the temper of the House.

The United Nations has been showing its lack of regard for its own principles and charter while expecting the United States to pick up the bill. In recent weeks the U.N. Security Council turned down an attempt to expel South Africa from the organization. Under the charter only the Security Council has that power. However, the U.N. General Assembly was not to be bound by these rules and regulations. To get rid of South Africa the General Assembly told the members of the South African delegation that they could no longer address the General Assembly nor participate in its committees.

As U.S. Ambassador John Scali charged, the ouster of South Africa for its racial policies was in clear violation of the U.N. Charter. Only the Security Council can vote to expel a member and only on the grounds of nonadherence to the principles of the charter. Expulsion of a member because of its internal policies—such as was done by the General Assembly—is prohibited.

In addition, the U.N. General Assembly managed to end the traditional freedom of speech that used to exist in that body. This was done by a ruling that no country's representative could speak more than once during debate. While allowing each Arab member to speak, Israel could only speak once during debate to defend itself. This came after a speech by a leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization—PLO—calling for the liquidation of Israel.

The leader of the PLO, Yasir Arafat, was greeted with wild jubilation. He addressed the Assembly wearing a pistol. His organization has been responsible for the deaths of many innocent civilians by its acts of terror.

Over the years the U.N. has seemed to pay less and less attention to its own founding principles. Three years ago the U.N. expelled the Republic of China on Taiwan from membership while admitting Red China.

There is a membership requirement in the U.N. Charter that states to be admitted must be "peace loving." The Republic of China obviously fitted that requirement. I, for one, did not think Red China did. Nonetheless, the Chinese on Taiwan were expelled—expelled by the votes of countries of which a majority had less population than Taiwan itself.

Another example of what I am talking about is last year's action in the U.N.'s Committee on Colonialism. This committee by a vote of 12 to 2 called on the United States to "refrain from taking any measures which might obstruct the full and free exercise by the people of Puerto Rico of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence."

In numerous elections the people of Puerto Rico have turned their backs on independence. The U.N. Committee on Colonialism seems to think that it knows better than the people of Puerto Rico themselves what they want.

All these U.N. activities are bad enough in themselves. What is even worse is that the United States, through its contributions, allows all this to happen. If the members of the U.N. were not so

sure that the United States would always bail them out of financial jams, they might allow more reason to enter their decisions.

The American people have been telling us that they are tired of excessive Government spending, that they are tired of giving money to foreign countries and international organizations who show no gratitude. We can send a message to the United Nations by approving my amendment.

It is time for the U.N. to get other countries to pick up the tab. Other countries are so quick to express themselves in the ways I have mentioned. Let them start paying the bill.

A recent estimate states that 92 of the 138 members of the U.N. owe \$204 million in back dues. The Soviet Union and its two other "republics" owe \$110 million alone. Additionally, numerous of these countries, including the Soviet Union, refuse to contribute to other U.N. programs. The result is that the United States continually bails the U.N. out. It is time to stop. It is time to start putting American interests first.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAN DANIEL

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAN DANIEL: At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, total contributions authorized herein to the United Nations or to any segment or subdivision of this world organization shall not exceed \$156,148,000."

(Mr. DAN DANIEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAN DANIEL. The purpose of this amendment is simple and straightforward. It is to maintain the U.S. contributions to the United Nations agencies at the same level it is estimated will be spent for 1974. The bill as proposed authorizes an increase of 24 percent. There are two reasons why I believe such a reduction is in order—one fiscal; the other, philosophical.

First, I can see no excuse whatsoever for increasing the funds we will turn over to an international body for its agencies when we are being asked to trim expenses on domestic programs. I cannot understand being asked to "bite the bullet," "tighten the belt," or any of the other timeworn clichés while we prop up this tower of Babel on the banks of the East River.

This money is not stuffed away in some corner over at the Treasury Department. It is not something left over, uncommitted, and available to be used at will. It is money which the Government will go into the tight money market and compete for against small business and the individual.

We will be told that the additional funds are needed because of inflation—that it is necessary to maintain that body in its current style. Well, who is going to maintain the American people in a like style? While inflation is at work on the United Nations budget, that same inflation is eating away at the income of the people each of us represents. Shall we say to these people, "Do not worry about it; we will take care of you in the same way we took care of the U.N."?

Second, there is the matter of philosophy. While we do not have the right to dictate internal policy to the United Nations, neither do we have the responsibility to continually increase our contributions to that body when we are its favorite target for abuse.

Actions the United Nations has taken recently leave grave questions as to that body's maturity.

Three times last month the United Nations displayed a meanness of temperament unbecoming an organization dedicated to peace in the world.

By denying South Africa's credentials, they avoided a confrontation they knew they could not win in the Security Council, and through a back-door approach achieved the ouster of one of the most diligent and conscientious members.

In a two-pronged action—permission for a Palestinian terrorist to address the U.N., then a vote to give observer status to the terrorist organization—they established a precedent of according tacit recognition of statehood to nonexistent bodies.

These are not the actions of a responsible, deliberative body. They are the actions of a mob bent on having its way at the expense of its own reputation for diplomacy and statesmanship.

The amount spelled out in this amendment, \$156,148,000, exceeds the amount authorized by section 302(a) for international organizations and programs. Its purpose is not to restrict any specific portion of the amounts provided to the United Nations. Rather, it is intended to set an upper limit on the amount of funds the United States will provide for all purposes to be spent by the United Nations.

Adoption of this amendment could save the American taxpayer \$37,552,000. I ask for an affirmation vote—to do otherwise is to reward irresponsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAN DANIEL).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ALEXANDER

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALEXANDER: Page 30, after line 12, insert the following new section: Countries Delinquent in Loan or Credit Repayments to the United States.

SEC. 35. It is the sense of the Congress that any country receiving assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which is in default, at least 90 days prior to the date of enactment of this Act, of any payment of principal or interest due on any loan or credit received from the United States shall promptly pay all such principal and interest. It is further the sense of the Congress that the President shall promptly enter into nego-

tiations with each such country to help effectuate the payment of such principal and interest, or to effectuate the transfer by such country to the United States of goods, services, concessions, or actions beneficial to the United States, in lieu of the payment of such principal and interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER).

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, it has been the foreign policy of this great Nation to help others in need. None can deny that we have marched side by side on the battlefields with our allies. Our brothers and sisters have died for the cause of peace. We have labored side by side with the citizens of the world's undeveloped nations in strengthening their economies.

And, we have taxed our citizens to help those countries torn by war and those whose development needs outstripped their available financial and technical resources.

Now, hostilities have ceased throughout most of our world. War-torn lands have been rebuilt. Many nations have made great strides toward development.

Today we find our Nation in a state of financial need. Not for loans from foreign friends. But for the repayment of just debts.

U.S. assistance helped heal the war-torn land of Iran. We have recently witnessed the offer of the Shah to invest more than \$200 million to bail out Lockheed from its financial bind. This offer is, in effect, made with money generated by an Iranian economy rebuilt partially with American foreign aid. Iran now owes the United States more than \$1 billion and is delinquent in its repayments more than \$39.3 million.

My amendment is written in such a way that it applies only to countries which are benefiting under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in order to avoid a "point of order." Nevertheless, its adoption should be an indisputably clear indication to the President and to the countries with past due debts owed to the people of this Nation that those debts are to be paid now and that future payments are to be made on time.

After 4 years of hearings by my Subcommittee on Foreign Operations it is my considered opinion that the State Department lacks the determination to represent the best interests of American taxpayers in the collection of foreign debts.

If all the foreign debts now delinquent were paid at this time it would balance the budget and have a dramatic effect on the sliding value of the dollars.

A document titled "Delinquent International Debts Owed to the United States, mid-1974 Progress Review" prepared in June by my subcommittee shows that as of December 31, 1973, 161 foreign nations and 11 foreign organizations owed the American people \$33,819,176,000. One hundred and eight of these countries and five of the institutions were at least 90 days overdue in their repayments, excluding \$20 billion in World War I debts, at that time. The past due payments totalled \$753,245,151.

Our sense of responsibility to humanity must be no less than in the past, but it must be tempered strongly by a sense of duty to help take the siphon of an inflated economy out of the pocketbooks of our citizens through an injection of foreign dollars provided us in repayment of just and due debts.

Passage of this amendment will help make it clear that as the United States intends to keep its commitments to other nations it intends that they keep their commitments to the people of the United States. And, it will help relieve the inflationary pressures now stifling our citizens.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I intended to offer an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964. It stated the sense of Congress that the people of Northern Ireland should be permitted to exercise the right of self-determination unless a clear majority of all the people of Northern Ireland choose to the contrary in a free and open plebiscite. However, since the Parliamentarian advised me it is not germane and hence out of order, I would like to speak to the subject for the Record.

Life today in Northern Ireland continues to be a living nightmare. Conditions in this nation over the past decade have represented one of the greatest living tragedies of modern history. The sectarian violence between Catholics and Protestants in this nation have left more than 1,000 dead and has led to the direct rule of the British Government in Northern Ireland. The British have proven to be barbaric and ruthless rulers. They have stripped the citizens of Northern Ireland of their basic freedoms and civil rights. Allow me to cite three cases depicting conditions in Northern Ireland today as provided to me by the Association for Legal Justice in Belfast.

Mrs. Marie Moreland told her shocking story this way:

At 3:00 a.m. the British Army called at my home to tell me that my husband was in the Royal Victorian Hospital . . . with only a couple of cuts and bruises. When I got to the hospital I discovered that Christopher's face was in shocking condition, and in fact he had suffered a broken jaw. What the Army did not tell me was that five of their armed soldiers had attacked my husband after they became engaged in a brief discussion on a street corner.

A young girl named Mary Allen of Belfast wrote:

British soldiers broke in and awakened us at 4:45 a.m. Mammy in bed—told to get everyone out of bed—and Joseph (brother) was shoved up against the wall. They took him away and began to search the house—tore up the entire house and held the family until 8:15 a.m.—no one was allowed out.

KATHLEEN DONNELLY OF BELFAST

Yesterday morning I went up to the doctor's. On coming home I stopped at a friend's house to see her. I spent the day with my friend and when I arrived home, I discovered that the army had blown up my house. The

reason, they claimed was that they found explosives in my yard, and they had to blow them up because they could not be removed.

These and other even more heinous actions occur almost daily in Northern Ireland. A large amount of the basis for these actions comes from the Special Powers Act, perhaps the most repressive document ever written by a government which was imposed by the British in Northern Ireland several years ago.

I have long contended that the key to solving the problems on Northern Ireland rests on two conditions. The first is the removal of all British troops from Northern Ireland, the second is what I call for in my amendment, the right of the people of Northern Ireland to exercise the right of self-determination.

This legislation nobly addresses itself to the plight of other nations in the world where repressive practices against the citizenry is practiced such as in Chile and South Korea. What we will be doing with this amendment is showing our equal concern over the plight of the people of Northern Ireland and our desire to see the British Government relinquish their hold on this nation.

It is symbolic that we are considering this amendment a mere 1 day after the worldwide observance of Human Rights Day. This Nation has been recognized around the world as the true champion of the rights of oppressed persons. Passage of this amendment today will establish our reputation as the defenders of the rights of the oppressed people of Northern Ireland.

I feel ever so strongly about this issue. I have visited Northern Ireland and saw first hand the sufferings and anguish of the citizens and the destruction of the nation as a whole. These situations need correction. Passage of this amendment today will represent a significant victory for the Irish people who look to this Nation for help in their quest to regain a life of freedom and dignity for themselves and their children. I urge your support for this amendment not only for the sake of the people of Northern Ireland but for the cause of freedom for all men around the world.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this delinquent debt amendment to the foreign aid bill. For too long the United States has been lax in collecting overdue foreign debts.

This nagging problem was made clear to me several years ago when I requested the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee to conduct a followup investigation of a GAO report on delinquent postal debts owed the United States. The subcommittee report, and subsequent hearings, indicate that our debt situation is less than satisfactory, and adequate progress is not being made toward solving this dilemma.

Total debts owed our country are now close to the \$60 billion mark. Of this

amount, nearly \$20 billion is overdue, most of it dating back to World War I. Over 100 countries are delinquent in their debt payments to our country.

These figures are extremely distressing, particularly in view of our present economic problems. Delinquent debts place an unfair burden on our economy and the American taxpayer at a time when we can ill afford such an extra burden.

The amendment before us deals specifically with those countries whose debts are delinquent under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. It simply states that the President should enter into negotiations with each country whose debt is overdue in an attempt to effectuate the payment of such debts.

According to Treasury Department figures, over \$280 million in payments is overdue under this program, so we are not talking about a trivial amount. I would suggest to my colleagues that even if the amount were only \$280 million the Government has an obligation to the American taxpayer to insure collection.

It seems to me that now, as we consider the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974, is a very appropriate time for Congress to express its concern and dismay over these delinquent debts, and to encourage the executive branch to give high priority to collecting such debts.

The time has come for the United States to impress upon foreign countries that American loans come from the taxpayers' pockets, and prompt repayment of these loans is expected by the American people, by the Congress, and by the Executive.

I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER), and the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of which he is a member, for their diligent efforts in the area of delinquent debts. Their work has already resulted in the repayment or rescheduling of more than \$125 million in delinquent debts since the subcommittee began studying the problem. But the bulk of the problem still exists, and I urge my colleagues to include this amount in the Foreign Assistance Act to encourage the administration to adopt a more aggressive program for the collection of overdue foreign debts.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in enthusiastic support of the gentleman's amendment. As the gentleman knows, I have been circulating a resolution for a number of years and have had as high as 246 Members of this House supporting resolution to collect the debts that are long overdue to this Nation. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I take this time to ask the gentleman: As to overdue debts from World War I which are just, legal, and binding debts

H 11634

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

December 11, 1974.

owed the United States; does this apply to them?

Mr. ALEXANDER. It does only to avoid a point of order, but it should be clear to the President that it does not in any way forgive those debts and should not be interpreted so by this amendment.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman. Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the appropriate number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a "sense" amendment. It applies only to countries receiving aid under the Foreign Assistance Act. It expresses the principle which everyone in the House really should uphold, namely, that countries owing us debt should repay the debt.

I want to point out that section 620 (q) of the Foreign Assistance Act, already in the act, requires suspension if a country is delinquent more than 6 months. This committee has actually, as the Committee on Foreign Aid, found this section has adequate controls and works very well.

The United States has never had to suspend, under section 620 (q). Generally, the less developed countries receiving U.S. assistance have a good record of repaying their debts. Delinquencies have been very infrequent. Foreign aid debt payments have gone about \$400 million a year.

There are, however, occasional difficulties and delays. Right now, with the world economic situation, because of oil prices and the oil squeeze and the increased cost of food and industrial goods, many countries are finding themselves in a pinch, like many Americans. The countries hurting the most are the poorest ones. Those are the ones we ought to be helping but we are hurting them with this amendment.

The solution to the problems brought about by world inflation is going to take some time. These problems are going to have to be worked out through international cooperation. For that reason, I have some reservations about this worthwhile amendment, and hope that it is not intended to cut off aid to those less able to cope with the oil and food price squeeze.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman had this amendment drawn up in a wide range to include many of the larger debts. Some were not germane to the Foreign Assistance Act. Because it would be subject to a point of order, he now has applied it solely to debts under the Foreign Assistance Act. The amendment really does not do any serious damage to the bill, but I just want to say that it is repetitious because section 620 (q) of the Act takes care of the same problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I support the Conte-Aspin-Esch amendment to the foreign aid authorization bill. I believe a ceiling on all U.S. aid to Cambodia is essential in helping to stop the war in that country and in helping to fight the war against inflation in this country.

Without this amendment, no real limit will be placed on U.S. aid to Cambodia. Instead, we will escalate strife there by providing funds for war. And we will do so at a cost to ourselves that we cannot afford, at a time when demands for national relief from recession cannot be ignored.

Mr. Chairman, if nothing else, the recent World Food Conference in Rome served as a reminder of misplaced priorities. We cannot continue to send vast sums of U.S. money for arms in Cambodia while advocating a cost-conscious policy toward hunger in South Asia and parts of Africa.

This amendment has been given wide support from a variety of organizations carrying a variety of ideological labels. The Senate bill adopted December 4 contains the same ceiling this amendment recommends. I join with supporters of this ceiling, and urge swift passage of this amendment.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, in the past I have consistently supported this country's foreign aid program, although country's foreign aid program, although I have had many serious reservations over some of its aims and objectives and, in certain instances, over the manner in which the program has been administered. I feel there has been a long-standing preoccupation with achieving short-term political goals and in mollifying opposition from overseas rather than attempting to aid in the establishment of a sound economic and social infrastructure upon which third world nations can base meaningful development. I do not believe the premises upon which our military assistance or foreign military sales programs are based are sound and feel they have helped to exacerbate international tensions rather than provide the security and economic/political stability which they theoretically seek.

I have carefully reviewed the report accompanying this measure and have particularly weighed the timely and very pertinent views of our colleague from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER). I share his concerns and would concur that the executive branch seems intent on pursuing its ill-considered policies, regardless of the sentiments and specific mandates of the Congress. Further, the able gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) has very aptly noted that "our foreign policy is heavily militarized" and this fact is clearly reflected in the legislation before us.

While I am deeply troubled over a number of aspects of the program which this measure continues and remain highly dubious about a number of the assistance effort's purposes, I will vote in favor of H.R. 17234 because it contains provisions which may help to reduce tensions in the Middle East, which will aid the production of desperately needed food in developing countries, which provides for the participation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in the Caribbean Development Bank and which, in certain instances, will aid in reasserting congressional authority in the country's foreign policy. I believe the positive aspects of this legislation, in the final analysis, outweigh the negative features.

Even though I will support this bill, I must once again express my strong opposition to the provision of assistance in any form to the Government of Syria, unless and until the Al-Assad regime ends the reign of terror being perpetrated against the Jewish minority in that land. A little more than a quarter of a century ago a thriving Jewish community of 30,000 existed in Syria. That number has dwindled to some 4,000 to 4,500 men, women, and children who have been subjected to some of the worse forms of discrimination, harassment, and abuse. Their travel within Syria is severely restricted and there is no freedom of emigration. They are under the constant surveillance of the secret police—the Muhabarat—and must carry identification cards with the word Jew marked on them.

In light of the treatment accorded to the Syrian Jewish community I cannot conceive even considering any form of assistance to that nation without first requiring that the Al-Assad government allow Jews to emigrate and to observe basic principles of human rights and human dignity in the treatment of minorities. I am encouraged by the attention which the Foreign Affairs Committee briefly gave to this pressing issue and am hopeful that the message is clearly received both in Damascus and in Foggy Bottom. Not only must full attention be given to the language authored by my good friend from the Bronx (Mr. BINGHAM) but the concurrent resolution veto process should be implemented—in order to carefully consider all aspects of any aid to Syria—if and when assistance is sought under the Special Requirements Fund.

On several occasions throughout the past 4 months a number of us have called attention to the fact that both the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Foreign Military Sales Act contain specific restrictions which prohibit the use of U.S. military equipment in the invasion of neutral nations. Inasmuch as Turkey has violated both the letter and spirit of these two laws, it has and continues to be ineligible to receive assistance. We must not compromise our principles or cave in to the entreaties of the Secretary of State. We must make clear that Turkish military forces must be removed from Cyprus before it can again be eligible to secure military aid. Simple justice and equity demand nothing less.

I am particularly disturbed, Mr. Chairman, that the administration has sought \$578.3 million for aid to Cambodia for the current fiscal year, almost 70 percent of which is for military aid. It is inconceivable that the amount of American aid to Cambodia has soared from \$8.7 million 5 years ago to over \$700 million in 1974, an increase of more than 8,000 percent. The Indochina war continues unabated in Cambodia and the toll of deaths and injuries now amounts to some 2,000 persons weekly.

An amendment will be offered to place a specific ceiling on all forms of aid to Cambodia at \$377 million, of which no more than \$200 million may be used for military assistance. American involvement in further ill-conceived military misadventures in Southeast Asia must be

curtailed and ended and I urge our colleagues to overwhelmingly support the amendment to be offered by Messrs. CONTE, ASPIN, and ESCH.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Africa, I am particularly concerned with the continual use of food and development assistance, both loans and grants, as a political weapon by the United States. The inevitable outcome of such a policy is the inequitable allocation of our development assistance, so that the most needy nations—many of which are in Africa—are also those which receive the least aid. Careful examination of the facts reveals that political, as opposed to humanitarian factors, are the significant criteria governing the distribution of U.S. assistance. And, the very low priority afforded independent, majority-ruled Africa in U.S. policy is reflected in the minuscule share of our assistance which Africa receives.

In fact, the recent exchange of letters between myself and the Department of State regarding the allocation of Public Law 480, title I, food resources illustrates these points. In the November 12 communication, the Department actually states:

Food is an important element in carrying out U.S. foreign policy initiatives such as those in the Middle East.

An analysis of those countries for which Public Law 480, title I programs were considered, as well as approved in the first half of fiscal year 1975, is even more revelatory. Of the 24 countries for which title I programs were considered, only 8—those 8 include: Bangladesh, Guinea, Haiti, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, and Tanzania—are among the 32 which the United Nations—in conjunction with the World Bank and other international organizations—has listed as being most seriously affected by the worldwide economic crisis. And, only two—Guinea and Tanzania—are among the hard-pressed African countries, south of the Sahara.

Of those five countries with whom title I agreements to date in fiscal year 1975 have been signed, only one, Bangladesh, for which there has been a widespread public outcry, is on the most seriously affected list. And, not one is in sub-Saharan Africa. The other four—Cambodia, Chile, Egypt, Vietnam—whose agreements authorize a total of \$163.5 million—the Bangladesh authorization is \$32.6 million—are fully illustrative of our foreign policy priorities.

That U.S. policy emphasizes such political priorities to the detriment of the poorest countries in the world is deplorable.

In Africa, which has 20 of 32 most seriously affected countries, this policy can have serious consequences. This is of particular significance when one considers the increase in requirements for food imports faced by the drought-stricken countries, as well as the negative impact of the increased cost of food, fertilizer, and petroleum on the ability of these nations to effectively respond to the droughts. As indicated in a written statement by Dr. Samuel Adams, AID

Administrator for Africa, submitted for November 19, 1974, hearings of the Subcommittee on Africa, the drought-affected areas face severe balance of payments deficits.

My visit last year to the African Sahel clearly underlined that these countries in particular, which are on the edge of bankruptcy and are among the least-developed countries in the world, have in many cases made heroic efforts to fight against widespread economic and human disasters, but with inadequate technical, financial, and administrative resources. In this connection, it remains vital that the U.S. commitment to a major long-term African development program to assist in the efforts of the Sahelian countries to build up their resources be a major priority of the forthcoming Congress.

An examination of per capita U.S. bilateral assistance and U.S. contributions to regional banks—Department of State figures—indicate that a proportionate share of U.S. assistance is not going to the neediest nations, most of which are in Africa. Developing Africa, excluding South Africa, receives 82 cents per capita of this assistance; developing black Africa, excluding North and South Africa, 76 cents; developing nonoil producing black Africa, 92 cents; developing nonoil-producing Latin America, excluding Ecuador, Trinidad-Tobago, and Venezuela, \$3.32; and, developing nonoil-producing Asia, excluding Indonesia, Iran, and Arab oil producers, \$1.99.

With specific regard to the newly and prospectively independent former Portuguese territories in Africa, it is clear that development assistance is of urgent importance. This is particularly pressing in the case of Mozambique, which expects independence on June 25, 1975. The Department of Commerce in August 1974—just before establishment of the new government with significant Frelimo participation—indicated the following:

Experiencing general economic malaise, aggravated by political uncertainties . . . Mozambique's short term economic outlook is poor. Major difficulties are: widespread labor unrest, which is disrupting production and important transportation services; rising inflationary pressures; an exodus of Portuguese and foreign skilled technicians and professionals, further depleting human resources; a deteriorating balance of payments leading to tighter import and currency; shortages of raw materials and tight credit in the industrial and civil construction sectors; and a profit squeeze in the commercial sector. Agriculture, on the other hand, should benefit from higher world and domestic prices.

It is my hope that in the coming year the United States will move forward with increased priority given to Africa's most pressing economic and humanitarian problems.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, as the House debates the Foreign Assistance Act, I wanted to interject a few words regarding our policy on the employment of U.S. citizens for projects financed by U.S. assistance funds. The laws governing our development assistance contain a preference for the use of U.S. goods and services. The Agency for In-

ternational Development, I know, has a policy of using, to the extent possible, U.S. employees, at least on the supervisory and professional levels. As far as I know, however, Congress has never conducted any sort of study on the possibility of increasing use of U.S. labor for development projects overseas, consistent with the need to reduce our unemployment at home, and without jeopardizing our goal of helping developing nations to help themselves. I realize that, in many cases, we try to draw upon local labor in an effort to foster acceptance for and involvement in the development project. I do not feel, however, that this goal of self help need be wholly inconsistent with an effort to make greater use of our work force at home.

As my colleagues know, several sectors of the American economy are in critical straits, unemployment in these areas being considerably higher than the national average. A good example is the construction industry, where unemployment among the construction trades ranges above 12 percent. It is, in fact, closer to 30 percent in my own district on Long Island. AID financed some 200 construction and engineering projects overseas last year. These projects generally helped our balance-of-payments position, but often had no direct positive impact upon areas of labor surplus here at home, that is, the construction trades. I am sure that, in a number of cases, the recipient country could not provide the skilled laborers, like carpenters or electricians, required for the project.

I think it would be beneficial for the Congress to examine from where we secured this labor, whether or not we drew upon the resources here at home. The laws governing our development assistance direct the President to take into account the possible effects of development assistance loans upon the U.S. economy, "with special reference to areas of substantial labor surplus." We would be wise to examine whether this consideration is, in fact, being given to high unemployment sectors of our economy.

Mr. Chairman, in the past several years, as we have struggled with our own economic problems, many Americans have come to question the wisdom of our foreign aid program. While I feel it is important for us to continue to assist developing nations, I recognize the legitimacy of complaints that we spend billions to improve other nations' economies while our own economy flounders. I believe if we could insure the American people that our foreign aid is not only consistent with our humanitarian principles and in the interests of our security, but also in the interests of our economic stability, we would find greater acceptance and support for the type of programs we are considering today. To insure a greater return on the dollar we send abroad, we should consider utilizing to a greater degree the resources and talents we have at home.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM). The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organiza-

H 11636

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

December 11, 1974

tion—UNESCO—has long been one of the most successful organs of international cooperation created under the auspices of the United Nations. UNESCO has drawn upon many of the world's leading scholars to foster the exchange of ideas and knowledge and provide assistance in science, education, and culture to the world's developing nations. UNESCO has succeeded in the past because it has kept its commitment to humanitarian objectives free from the taint of political partisanship and factional strife.

The recent meeting of UNESCO's General Conference in Paris, however, produced a fundamental change in the character of the organization. The resolutions enacted which deny UNESCO aid and regional group membership to Israel are that Israel has failed to protect historical sites in Jerusalem, used to justify these resolutions, are repudiated by the reports of UNESCO's own investigators. By securing the adoption of these resolutions, the Arab enemies of Israel have transformed a humanitarian organization into a weapon of political propaganda.

This perversion of UNESCO's apolitical character constitutes a violation of its own charter which specifies "collaboration among the nations through education, science, and culture" as the organization's chief objective. UNESCO's action against Israel brought about an immediate response from leading scholars throughout the world, including Nobel laureates in the arts and sciences, who announced that they will no longer lend their talents to UNESCO's work. These scholars expressed no views on the political conflict in the Middle East; they merely deplored the misuse of an apolitical, humanitarian organization by any faction in this fashion.

I urge my colleagues to adopt that same position here today by supporting the amendment before us. I sincerely hope that UNESCO will repeal these political resolutions and return to its important work as a medium of international cooperation and humanitarian aid. But as long as this organization is being exploited as a political tool, in contravention of its mandate, the United States should express its strong disapproval by withholding financial support of UNESCO's programs.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to set a spending ceiling on all U.S. assistance to South Vietnam. I believe this to be a prudent and necessary step if we are to have control over the amounts of aid we send to South Vietnam. A parliamentary situation exists, however, which precluded my offering this amendment.

My amendment would have done two things: set a spending ceiling on all U.S. assistance to South Vietnam, and attempt to deal with the increasing prostitution and politicalization of the food for peace program in South Vietnam which has continued to pervert the original objectives of this program. This kind of action would be instrumental in reducing only the amount of Public Law 480 assistance to South Vietnam from the

\$125 million figure in the Senate-passed version to \$40 million, without affecting the levels of military and economic assistance contemplated for South Vietnam.

Admirably, the administration has projected \$19.5 million in the Public Law 480 program for the first 6 months of this fiscal year; this would then be followed with an equal amount for the second half of the year. This reduction by the administration has been made possible by a substantially increased rice harvest over last year's level—an increase in production of over 100,000 metric tons. Thus, a decrease in our level of participation in the food for peace program to South Vietnam is certainly in order, especially in light of the dire hunger situation that exists in many other countries.

The \$85 million that would be freed could substantially aid in providing food relief for those countries most seriously affected by the world food crisis as recognized by the United Nations.

Congressional intent in placing limits on the amount of aid to South Vietnam has been consistently subverted by the administration. For the last fiscal year, almost half of the entire Public Law 480 program was diverted to support the war economies of South Vietnam and Cambodia. Tragically, as Senators HATFIELD and CLARK and others have observed, the U.S. food for peace program has turned out, in fact, to be food for war. This abuse by the administration would have been checked by this amendment and assured that this kind of abuse would not occur in the future.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for the U.S. Congress to not only assert its will in placing a limit to our aid to South Vietnam, but to direct our energies in the area of food assistance to those countries where starvation and famine is most prevalent. I urge my colleagues in conference to look favorably on a spending ceiling, and to especially make every effort to substantially reduce the amount of Public Law 480 assistance to South Vietnam.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fraser amendment which will provide that military assistance to South Korea not exceed \$145 million, provided that if President Ford reports to Congress that South Korea's Government has made substantial progress toward restoring international standards of human rights, then the ceiling will be raised to \$165 million. Military assistance authorized for South Korea in fiscal year 1974 was \$175 million.

In foreign policy as in everything else, actions speak louder than words. Some would prefer that we reduce our moral outrage against the actions by the Government of South Korea to mere rhetoric.

I am assuming that during the recent visit to South Korea, President Ford conveyed to President Park Chung Hee, our violent objections to the denials of civil liberties, imprisonment, and death sentences imposed on his political opponents.

I have strong misgivings about mili-

tary assistance in any case. Our Vietnam experience taught us there that unlimited military assistance provided no security whatsoever where the government had lost the respect and cooperation of its people. Military assistance instead helped then to isolate the government from the effective voice of the people.

Foreign aid which supports repression and denial of civil liberties in any part of the world makes a farce out of our commitment to freedom.

I believe the amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which cuts the aid request to South Korea from \$175 million to \$145 is a clear signal to South Korea of our concern. President Park ought to get the message quickly. I do not believe in meddling with the internal affairs of any nation; but we certainly should not be helping those whose policies we disapprove. I urge your vote of this amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleagues, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ASPIN, and Mr. ESCH, to place a \$377 million ceiling on all American aid to Cambodia, with a limit of \$200 million military aid.

I have long felt that the United States should discontinue, or at least drastically reduce, its massive expenditures in Cambodia and I firmly believe it is time that we reordered our foreign aid priorities. It makes no sense for the United States to support the Cambodian Government in its military activities when people are starving in Africa, Latin America, South Asia, and other parts of the world. There is no reason for the United States to bear 90 percent of the costs of the Cambodian Government when America is facing the greatest economic crisis since the Depression.

This amendment offers a decisive measure by which we can reduce the Federal budget and through which we can reverse our policy of continuing to fund the war in Southeast Asia. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment, offered by Mr. FRASER of Minnesota, relating to South Korea represents something of a watershed for the American aid program because it brings clearly to the fore the fundamental issue of the purpose of our assistance efforts.

Throughout the history of our various foreign assistance programs we have viewed them as evidence of our high ideals and principles, our humanitarian concern, and our commitment to world economic development. Looking at our actual aid allotments, however, leads to the conclusion that we are more committed to military assistance in the name of stability and national security than we are to humanitarian aid. This foreign aid authorization now before us, for example, includes \$1.735 billion out of a total of \$2.643 billion in the three categories of security supporting assistance, military assistance programs, and military credit sales. This is almost two-thirds of the total. In this regard, it is also fair to point out that our extensive military aid programs have not produced

stability. Our money in Vietnam, Cambodia, India, Pakistan, and the Middle East, including Cyprus, has still left war, destruction, and bitterness.

Efforts to reduce this proportion have been made in other amendments but the Korean case stands clear as a test of our commitment to human rights and freedoms. Several months ago when I first spoke on the Korean matter, I stated:

Over the years the United States has given assistance to a wide variety of nations and governments all over the world, and I do not propose that we begin to provide assistance only to those nations which have governments like our own or only to those governments which agree with our policies. However, I do believe that there are certain fundamental human rights common to all peoples and that we have an obligation to be sensitive to the denial of those rights and reflect our concern in our aid policies. Countries which resort to terror and torture to suppress freedom of expression should certainly not be allowed to do so with our money.

Having studied the Korean situation in the intervening months, it is apparent to me that our assistance to South Korea has helped to produce a garrison state armed to the teeth against the threat of invasion from the North—a threat which is very real—and increasingly fortified against any expression of freedom by its citizenry. While South Korea has an average of 79 school-age children per teacher, it has 50 people for each soldier, a ratio which ranks it 10th in the world; the United States is 21st and North Korea is 2d, along with North and South Vietnam, Cambodia, Jordan, Israel, and Portugal. The nation spends more money on its military than on health and education combined.

Heavy military expenditures are understandable in a state with a threat to its national security, but I feel constrained to point out that in the Korean case, while the threat is external—from the North—available evidence indicates the government is spending an increasing portion of its time and resources on possible internal threats of subversion. While this seeing spies behind every door could be comical, it has in fact been tragic for the people of South Korea, who have witnessed a steady erosion of their freedoms and their right to participate freely in the political process. As I said last August, whether such an erosion occurs is fundamentally the responsibility of the Koreans and their government, but it is within our power to see that it does not take place with our money, and we must exercise that power.

The Fraser amendment does this judiciously. It does not cut off military aid—it merely restricts it to last year's level and requires Presidential certification on the human rights issue before more than 70 percent can be used. This is a reasonable restraint in terms of South Korea's security needs, and it will be an important signal to the Park government that this country is committed to human rights in fact as well as in word.

A this point in my remarks I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention some specific examples of the kind of repression going on in South Korea:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 26, 1974]

SEOUL SAYS IT WILL CARRY OUT EXECUTION OF SEVEN DISSIDENTS

(By Fox Butterfield)

SEOUL, SOUTH KOREA.—They came to the door before sunrise one day last April, saying they were workers from her husband's construction company. But a week after they took him away, Mrs. To Ye Jong read in the newspaper that her husband was in jail, accused of being the leader of a Communist spy group called the People's Revolutionary party.

For Mrs. To, a 45-year-old former school-teacher, it was like reliving an old nightmare. In 1964 her husband was convicted on the same charge, and served three years in prison.

But this time Mr. To and six other men have been sentenced to be executed. According to Mrs. To and other relatives of defendants who were allowed to attend the closed military trial, the men testified that they had been tortured into making confessions and that they had not been permitted to call witnesses in their defense.

The wives of several of the defendants say that the men did not even know one another before their arrest.

The case, in which 21 men were found guilty is one of the most bizarre in South Korea's history of political repression. It is also a critically important case, because the Government cited the People's Revolutionary party as the reason for President Park Chung Hee's emergency decrees last April cracking down on his opponents and banning all dissidence. The Government said that the group, acting under orders from the Communist Government in North Korea, had organized student demonstrations against Mr. Park.

CONVICTIONS LACK CREDIBILITY

A total of 203 persons, including South Korea's only living former President, a Roman Catholic bishop and the country's best known poet were convicted under the decree and an earlier one last winter. Without the vital link to North Korea allegedly provided by the People's Revolutionary Party, these convictions would have lacked even the little credibility they had.

Mr. Park has since lifted the decrees after the assassination of his wife in August, and higher courts have reduced the sentences of some of the students, clergymen and intellectuals convicted under them.

But an authoritative Government official said that Mr. Park would not commute the sentences of the members of the People's Revolutionary party and plans to have them executed.

Despite the severity of the penalties, few South Koreans have dared question the verdict in the case. An American Methodist missionary, George Ogle, who talked about the case during a meeting of the Korean National Council of Churches, was detained overnight by the South Korean Central Intelligence Agency and has been told that he may lose his visa.

The account that follows has been pieced together from the tangled statements of family members, who were warned not to talk about the case, a spokesman for the court-martial and other Government officials. No outsiders except one relative for each defendant were permitted to attend the court sessions inside the Ministry of National Defense.

There are many disputed points and unresolved puzzles in the case.

Although Government officials have said in interviews that four spies captured while infiltrating from North Korea had provided vital information on the People's Revolutionary party, they did not testify at the trial.

A spokesman for the Defense Ministry said that the prosecution did produce three other witnesses against the 21 defendants. But the spokesman added that "several" of these witnesses had also "testified for the defendants, because of conflicting statements made by them." Family members assert there were no witnesses for either the defense or the prosecution.

Much of the Government's evidence seems fragmentary. Against Mr. To, the prosecutors produced an unmarked envelope that had contained money for his maid, and three books, all printed in Seoul, including one by Kim Dae Jung, the opposition leader kidnapped from a Tokyo hotel room last year by the South Korean Central Intelligence Agency.

The Government's most important evidence, a spokesman for the Ministry of National Defense said, consisted of a speech broadcast on the radio by President Kim Il Sung of North Korea and copied down by one of the defendants, Ha Jae Wan. But relatives of the defendants asserted that the Government had not shown how these notes were related to the group's alleged effort to organize students and overthrow President Park.

While four of the wives said their husbands had testified that their confession had been extracted by torture, the Defense Ministry spokesman said, "at no time during the proceedings did the defendants say they had been tortured." The spokesman added that "pretrial investigations revealed they had been rather well treated."

As Mrs. Woo Hung Sun recalls her husband's testimony, he told the military judge: "I thought if they beat me any longer my heart would break. The C.I.A. agent who was torturing me was drunk, and he took my hand and forced me to sketch out a signature on the confession."

But Mrs. Woo says that when her husband, a bookkeeper, asked the judge to compare the signature with his real one, the judge replied, "Sit down and be quiet."

Mr. Woo, a 44-year-old wounded veteran of the Korean war, was sentenced to death. He had been convicted and given a suspended sentence in 1964. According to his wife, he knew only one of the other prisoners.

CIA CHIEF HAD ROLE

There are other strange circumstances in the case. The present director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Shin Jik Soo, was South Korea's attorney general in 1964 in charge of prosecuting the earlier indictment against the People's Revolutionary party. The present head of the South Korean C.I.A.'s sixth bureau, in charge of this year's investigation was one of the main agents in the 1964 case.

In the earlier case, three of the four prosecutors, because of a lack of evidence, resigned rather than bring the men to trial. When only two of the 47 men arrested as members of the People's Revolutionary party in 1964 were convicted, the Government held a second trial using a different charge.

Thirteen men were found guilty in that second trial 10 years ago, and most of them have been under regular police surveillance since their release from prison.

Western intelligence specialists say that they believe there is a group called the People's Revolutionary party operating in South Korea and that it may have up to 60 small cells of three or four men each.

But these officials also say it is doubtful that many, if any, of those under arrest now are members of the actual People's Revolutionary party.

To Mrs. Ha Jae Wan, whose husband copied the speech of North Korea's President, the whole experience has been "like being hit by a hit-and-run driver."

When her husband, a brewery worker,

told the judge that he had been tortured for three days in the basement of the C.I.A.'s headquarters and not allowed to sleep, one of the prosecutors shouted: "You obviously haven't been tortured enough."

Mr. Ha, who is 42, provided the government's only link between the People's Revolutionary party and the students in that eight years ago he had hired a student named Yoo Chong Nam to tutor his children. Mr. Yoo has been accused of having been the chief organizer of the student demonstrations. He was also sentenced to death.

As a result of Mr. Ha's conviction his five children have been physically mistreated or ostracized by their schoolmates. Mrs. Ha said. The eldest son, 18, had to drop out of high school after repeated fights in which he lost several teeth and received a bad gash on his forehead.

The youngest, a 3-year-old boy, was tied to a tree and beaten with sticks by classmates and his teachers in a kindergarten he attends.

Jon Chang II, another of the defendants, was a native of North Korea who fled south in 1950 to escape the regimentation of his life working in a fertilizer factory. During the Korean war he served as an interpreter with the United States Army, and in recent years he had become a foreman for a construction company.

According to his wife, who is 40, Mr. Jon was not at all political. So she was surprised when he was taken away by police agents late one night last spring. Mr. Jon, who was not arrested in the 1964 case, received a life sentence.

Now Mrs. Jon is angry. "An old Korean proverb says, 'even the most humble insect writhes when you step on it,'" she said. "My husband was the kind of man who would have no idea what to do if you gave him the Government. How would he know how to overthrow it?"

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support H.R. 17234 on final passage because of essential programs contained in the bill for the defense and security of Israel, a nation founded by the world community as part of the settlement of the Second World War under the auspices of the United Nations.

I intend to support this bill because it will provide funds to aid the hungry and the destitute of the world.

I intend to support this bill because well over 22 significant amendments were adopted in committee which slashed administration requests by \$609.4 million.

Other amendments will be offered cutting authorizations in the bill and I intend to support all reasonable amendments on the floor. It is my belief that we must be able to go to the country with legislation that involves the minimum of spending for foreign assistance compatible with a decent respect for our obligations abroad.

I believe in common with many of my colleagues on the committee that we must cut back our military assistance programs in favor of economic programs. Our program is so out of balance in this regard that we spend more in Cambodia than we do on the continent of Africa which faces the scourge of starvation.

The key issue facing the United States of America is how to maintain the support of the American people for our foreign policy at a time when we are subject to an economic recession at home. In this light it is important to face the need for lean foreign assistance legisla-

tion. The committee has made the attempt. Programs will be reduced in future legislation. As to this Congress and this bill, I can say that the committee has done excellent work in controlling spending for foreign assistance in a dangerous world.

I urge the support of the House for H.R. 17234.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment to withhold the U.S. contribution to UNESCO until it has repealed its recent political resolutions.

As a long-time supporter of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, I am very disappointed that this confusion of purpose has arisen. UNESCO was set up to facilitate educational, scientific, and cultural exchange and development. It was not authorized to make political decisions. If we permit such political manipulation of United Nations agencies, we will help to violate the very Charter of the United Nations.

To exclude Israel from any of the five regional groupings is a highly discriminatory act. It is particularly ironic in view of the fact that Israel contributes more to UNESCO than it receives: In 1974, for instance, Israel's contribution was \$111,000, and in 1973, around \$98,000. During that biennial period Israel received only \$24,000.

Our hope for the United Nations was that by working together on various needed projects, nations would come to understand each other. This is more than ever necessary for the tension-ridden Middle East. We must not allow the specialized agencies to make discriminatory decisions of this nature.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17234) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes; pursuant to House Resolution 1468, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Without qualification, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without qualification, the gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 17234) to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 14, strike out line 5 down through line 12 on page 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

SEC. 15. Chapter 1 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 502B. HUMAN RIGHTS.—(a) For each fiscal year, after the date of enactment of this section, no security assistance may be obligated or expended for any country under this Act and no sale of any defense article or service (whether for cash or by credit, guaranty, or any other means) may be made to any country under the Foreign Military Sales Act until—

"(1) the President certifies to the Congress that such country is not engaging in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, including torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; prolonged detention without charges; or other flagrant denials of the rights to life, liberty, and the security of the person; and

"(2) the passage of thirty days after such certification under paragraph (1), during which the Congress does not adopt a concurrent resolution disapproving such certification.

The certification under paragraph (1) shall occur within thirty days after the beginning of each fiscal year, except that for fiscal year 1975 such certification shall occur within 60 days after the date of enactment of this section.

"(b) For purposes of this section, 'security assistance' means assistance under chapter 2 (military assistance) or chapter 4 (security supporting assistance) of this part, assistance under part V (Indochina Postwar Reconstruction) or part VI (Middle East Peace) of this Act, sales and guarantees of such sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act, and assistance for public safety under this Act."

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the motion to recommit?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will take only a moment to explain. The language of this recommittal motion is similar to that which I offered in the Committee of the Whole. There is, however, one important difference. I have taken into account the criticism made, in the absence of some qualifying language on human rights such as is contained in the committee bill. The language in the motion to recommit incorporates the language in the committee bill. I believe it ought to be acceptable to those who were of the opinion that the original language was deficient.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MORGAN).

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit is virtually the same as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) in the Committee of the Whole. The gentleman has incorporated some new language in order to qualify it, as he has said, but the proposal still would set

up a huge Federal bureaucracy in order to make this procedure work.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members who listened to the debate in the Committee of the Whole cannot have their minds changed by the few qualifications the gentleman has put in here as section 1 and section 2.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, who is the author of most of the human rights legislation in the committee bill.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, under different circumstances I would hope that this kind of proposal would get consideration, but the human rights language in the committee bill was worked out in consultation with representatives of the State Department. This represents an agreed upon position. While ordinarily I would like to go for stronger language than that which is contained here, I feel I am obligated to carry out the understanding and the agreement I entered into, and which the committee entered into. Therefore I must accept the language contained in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances, I support the language of the bill, and I will vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I too, oppose the motion to recommit, and I do so because I feel it would impose an intolerable burden upon the President of the United States. I have reference to the language found on page 14, starting on line 9, which allows the President to take action against any particular country which engages in egregious, gross violations of human rights.

The obligation that would be imposed by the motion to recommit would be quite contrary. It would require a certification with respect to any country that is to receive aid by this country. It would require a mandatory delay of 30 days while Congress mulls over whether they consider the certification accurate or not.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if we want to concern ourselves with gross violations, we ought to single out a few individual countries and not all of them.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa in his motion to recommit would include the following language:

The President certifies to the Congress that such country is not engaging in a consistent pattern * * *.

This is a real departure from the usual position taken by the gentleman from Iowa, because I have spent 20 long years listening to the gentleman criticize the Congress for giving up power to the executive and passing it on to the President. I am surprised to see this language offered by the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this also

gives the Congress veto power over anything the President may do.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the first paragraph here the gentleman includes the language: "The President certifies to the Congress * * *."

I have heard criticism from the gentleman from Iowa at least a hundred times on that very issue, and he now wants this language included.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am simply trying to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, that is all.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device; and there were—yeas 201, nays 190, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 674]

YEAS—201

Abzug	Daniels	Horton
Addabbo	Dominick V.	Hosmer
Alexander	Danielson	Johnson, Pa.
Anderson, Ill.	Dellenback	Jones, Ala.
Annunzio	Dellums	Jordan
Arends	Dennis	Kluczyński
Armstrong	Dewinski	Koch
Ashley	Diggs	Kyros
Aspin	Dingell	Leggett
Badillo	Donohue	Lehman
Baker	Drinan	Lent
Bell	du Pont	Long, La.
Bergland	Eckhardt	Long, Md.
Biaggi	Edwards, Calif.	McClary
Blester	Ellberg	McCloskey
Bingham	Erlenborn	McDade
Blackburn	Esch	McFall
Boggs	Evans, Colo.	McKay
Boland	Fascell	McKinney
Bolling	Findley	Macdonald
Brademas	Flood	Madden
Breaux	Foley	Madigan
Breckinridge	Ford	Mallory
Brooks	Forsythe	Matsunaga
Broomfield	Fraser	Mayne
Brotzman	Frelinghuysen	Meeds
Brown, Mich.	Frenzel	Metcalfe
Broyhill, Va.	Froehlich	Mezvinaky
Buchanan	Gilman	Michel
Burke, Calif.	Gonzalez	Minish
Burke, Mass.	Gray	Mink
Burton, John	Green, Pa.	Mitchell, Md.
Carney, Ohio	Grover	Moakley
Cederberg	Gubser	Moorhead, Pa.
Chamberlain	Gude	Morgan
Chisholm	Guyer	Murphy, Ill.
Clark	Hamilton	Murphy, N.Y.
Clay	Hanley	Nedzi
Cohen	Hanna	Nelsen
Collins, Ill.	Hanrahan	Nix
Conte	Harrington	O'Brien
Corman	Heckler, Mass.	O'Neill
Cotter	Heinz	Parris
Coughlin	Helstoski	Patman
Cronin	Hogan	Patten
Culver	Holtzman	Pepper

Peyser
Freyer
Price, Ill.
Quie
Rallsback
Rangel
Rees
Regula
Reid
Reuss
Rhodes
Riegle
Rinaldo
Robison, N.Y.
Roe
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roy
Roybal
Ryan
Sandman

Sarasin
Sarbanes
Schneebell
Schroeder
Seiberling
Shoup
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stanton
J. William
Stark
Steele
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stratton
Symington
Teague
Thompson, N.J.
Traxler
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin

Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Waldie
Ware
Whalen
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson,
Charles, Tex.
Winn
Wolf
Wright
Wyatt
Wyder
Yates
Yatron
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—190

Abdnor	Haley	Price, Tex.
Adams	Hammer-	Pritchard
Anderson,	schmidt	Quillen
Calif.	Harsha	Randall
Andrews, N.C.	Hastings	Rarick
Andrews,	Hawkins	Roberts
N. Dak.	Hechler, W. Va.	Robinson, Va.
Archer	Henderson	Rogers
Ashbrook	Hicks	Roncallo, Wyo.
Bafalis	Hillis	Rose
Bauman	Hinsaw	Roush
Beard	Holt	Roussellot
Bennett	Huber	Runnels
Bevill	Hudnut	Ruppe
Blatnik	Hungate	Ruth
Bowen	Hunt	St Germain
Bray	Hutchinson	Satterfield
Brinkley	Ichord	Scherle
Brown, Calif.	Jarman	Sebelius
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Calif.	Shipley
Broyhill, N.C.	Johnson, Colo.	Shriver
Burgener	Jones, Okla.	Shuster
Burleson, Tex.	Jones, Tenn.	Sikes
Burlison, Mo.	Karh	Sisk
Butler	Kastenmeier	Skubitz
Byron	Kazen	Slack
Carter	Kemp	Snyder
Casey, Tex.	Ketchum	Spence
Chappell	King	Staggers
Clausen,	Lagomarsino	Stanton,
Don H.	Landgrebe	James V.
Clawson, Del.	Landrum	Steed
Cleveland	Latta	Steelman
Cochran	Lott	Steiger, Ariz.
Collins, Tex.	Lujan	Stephens
Conlan	McCollister	Stubblefield
Conyers	McCormack	Stuckey
Crane	McEwen	Studds
Daniel, Dan	Mahon	Sullivan
Daniel, Robert	Mann	Symms
W. Jr.	Maraziti	Talcott
Davis, Ga.	Martin, Nebr.	Taylor, Mo.
Davis, S.C.	Martin, N.C.	Taylor, N.C.
de la Garza	Mathis, Ga.	Thomson, Wis.
Delaney	Mazzoli	Thone
Denholm	Melcher	Thornton
Dent	Milford	Towell, Nev.
Devine	Miller	Treen
Dickinson	Mitchell, N.Y.	Veysey
Dorn	Mizell	Vigorito
Downing	Molloy	Waggonner
Dulski	Montgomery	Walsh
Duncan	Moorhead,	Wampler
Edwards, Ala.	Calif.	White
Evins, Tenn.	Mosher	Whitehurst
Flowers	Moss	Whitten
Flynt	Murtha	Wilson,
Fountain	Myers	Charles H.,
Frey	Natcher	Calif.
Fulton	Nichols	Wylie
Fuqua	Obey	Young, Alaska
Gaydos	Owens	Young, Fla.
Gettys	Perkins	Young, S.C.
Gibbons	Pettis	Young, Tex.
Ginn	Pickle	Zion
Gross	Pike	
Gunter	Poage	

NOT VOTING—43

Barrett	Fish	Hébert
Brasco	Fisher	Holifield
Burke, Fla.	Gialmo	Howard
Burton, Phillip	Goldwater	Jones, N.C.
Camp	Goodling	Kuykendall
Carey, N.Y.	Grasso	Littin
Clancy	Green, Oreg.	Lukens
Collier	Griffiths	McSpadden
Conable	Hansen, Idaho	Mathias, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	Hansen, Wash.	Mills
Eshleman	Hays	Minshall, Ohio

O'Hara
Passman
Fodell
Powell, Ohio

Rodino
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, N.Y.
Tiernan

Wilson, Bob
Wyman

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Minshall of Ohio for, with Mr. Fisher against.
Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Hays against.
Mr. Gialmo for, with Mr. Burke of Florida against.
Mr. Howard for, with Mr. Camp against.
Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Eshleman against.
Mr. Fish for, with Mr. Passman against.
Mr. Rodino for, with Mr. Powell of Ohio against.
Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Roncallo of New York against.
Mr. Conable for, with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin against.
Mr. Carey of New York for, with Mr. Clancy against.
Mr. Tiernan for, with Mr. Wyman against.
Mrs. Griffiths for, with Mr. Goldwater against.
Mr. Collier for, with Mr. Jones of North Carolina against.
Mr. Hollifield for, with Mr. Litton against.
Mrs. Grasso for, with Mr. McSpadden against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Luken.
Mr. Hansen of Idaho with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
Mr. Bob Wilson with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Mathias of California with Mrs. Green of Oregon.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT WITH REGARD TO TURNING IN EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members know, it is required under the rule that any extensions of remarks be sent to room H132 by 9 o'clock. Due to the lateness of the hour, that time will be extended until 10:30.

THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1974

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 3394) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3394

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Assistance Act of 1974".

FOOD AND NUTRITION

SEC. 2. Section 103 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

- (1) by inserting the subsection designation "(a)" immediately before "In";
- (2) by striking out "\$291,000,000 for each

of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$291,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, and \$830,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) The Congress finds that, due to rising world food, fertilizer, and petroleum costs, human suffering and deprivation are growing in the poorest and most slowly developing countries. The greatest potential for significantly expanding world food production at relatively low cost lies in increasing the productivity of small farmers who constitute a majority of the nearly one billion people living in those countries. Increasing the emphasis on rural development and expanded food production in the poorest nations of the developing world is a matter of social justice as well as an important factor in slowing the rate of inflation in the industrialized countries. In the allocation of funds under this section, special attention should be given to increasing agricultural production in the countries with per capita incomes under \$300 a year and which are the most severely affected by sharp increases in worldwide commodity prices.

"(c) Of the total amount obligated under this Act during any fiscal year after fiscal year 1975 to procure fertilizers for, and to provide such fertilizers to, foreign countries, not more than one-third of such amount may be obligated with respect to South Vietnam."

POPULATION PLANNING

SEC. 3. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) In section 104, strike out "\$145,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975" and insert in lieu thereof "\$145,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, and \$165,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975".

(2) In section 292, strike out "\$130,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000,000".

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 4. Section 105 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$90,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$90,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, and \$92,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975".

DISPOSITION OF LOAN RECEIPTS

SEC. 5. Section 203 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. FISCAL PROVISIONS.—On and after July 1, 1975, none of the dollar receipts scheduled to be paid during any fiscal year from loans made pursuant to this part or from loans made under predecessor foreign assistance legislation are authorized to be made available during any fiscal year for use for purposes of making loans under chapter 1 of this part. All such receipts shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

HOUSING GUARANTIES

SEC. 6. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) In section 221, strike out "\$305,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$405,000,000".

(2) In section 223(i), strike out "June 30, 1975" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1976".

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT PROGRAMS

SEC. 7. (a) Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by striking out the title heading and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE III—HOUSING AND OTHER CREDIT GUARANTY PROGRAMS";

(2) by inserting immediately after section 222 the following new section:

"SEC. 222A. AGRICULTURAL AND PRODUCTIVE CREDIT AND SELF-HELP COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.—(a) It is the sense of the Congress that in order to stimulate the par-

ticipation of the private sector in the economic development of less-developed countries in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be used to establish pilot programs in not more than five Latin American countries to encourage private banks, credit institutions, similar private lending organizations, cooperatives, and private nonprofit development organizations to make loans on reasonable terms to organized groups and individuals residing in a community for the purpose of enabling such groups and individuals to carry out agricultural credit and self-help community development projects for which they are unable to obtain financial assistance on reasonable terms. Agricultural credit and assistance for self-help community development projects should include, but not be limited to, material and such projects as wells, pumps, farm machinery, improved seed, fertilizer, pesticides, vocational training, food industry development, nutrition projects, improved breeding stock for farm animals, sanitation facilities, and looms and other handicraft aids.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the agency primarily responsible for administering part I is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as it shall determine, to private lending institutions, cooperatives, and private nonprofit development organizations in not more than five Latin American countries assuring against loss of not to exceed 50 per centum of the portfolio of such loans made by any lender to organized groups or individuals residing in a community to enable such groups or individuals to carry out agricultural credit and self-help community development projects for which they are unable to obtain financial assistance on reasonable terms. In no event shall the liability of the United States exceed 75 per centum of any one loan.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$15,000,000. Not more than 10 per centum of such sum shall be provided for any one institution, cooperative, or organization.

"(d) The Inter-American Foundation shall be consulted in developing criteria for making loans eligible for guaranty coverage in Latin America under this section.

"(e) Not to exceed \$3,000,000 of the guaranty reserve established under section 223 (b) shall be available to make such payments as may be necessary to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under this section or any guaranties previously issued under section 240 of this Act.

"(f) Funds held by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation pursuant to section 236 may be available for meeting necessary administrative and operating expenses for carrying out the provisions of this section through June 30, 1976.

"(g) The Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall, upon enactment of this subsection, transfer to the agency primarily responsible for administering part I all obligations, assets, and related rights and responsibilities arising out of, or related to the predecessor program provided for in section 240 of this Act.

"(h) The authority of this section shall continue until December 31, 1977.

"(i) Notwithstanding the limitation in subsection (c) of this section, foreign currencies owned by the United States and determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be excess to the needs of the United States may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this section, including the discharge of liabilities under this subsection. The authority conferred by this subsection shall be in addition to authority conferred by any other provision of law to implement guaranty programs utilizing excess local currency.

"(j) The President shall, on or before January 15, 1976, make a detailed report to

the Congress on the results of the program established under this section, together with such recommendations as he may deem appropriate.”;

(3) by striking out “section 221 or section 222” in section 223(a) and inserting “section 221, 222, or 222A” in lieu thereof;

(4) by striking out “this title” in section 223(b) and inserting “section 221 and section 222” in lieu thereof; and

(5) by striking out “section 221 or section 222” in section 223(d) and inserting “section 221, 222, 222A, or previously under section 240 of this Act” in lieu thereof.

(b) Title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out section 240.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

Sec. 8. Section 302(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out “for the fiscal year 1975, \$150,000,000” and inserting in lieu thereof “for the fiscal year 1975, \$186,900,000”.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATIONS

Sec. 9. Section 504(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out “\$521,500,000 for the fiscal year 1974” and inserting in lieu thereof “\$550,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975”.

SPECIAL AUTHORITY

Sec. 10. Section 506 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is repealed.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR SOUTH VIETNAM

Sec. 11. Section 513 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out “Thailand and Laos” in the caption and insert in lieu thereof “Thailand, Laos, and South Vietnam”.

(2) At the end thereof add the following new subsection:

“(c) After June 30, 1976, no military assistance shall be furnished by the United States to South Vietnam directly or through any other foreign country unless that assistance is authorized under this Act or the Foreign Military Sales Act.”

EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES

Sec. 12. (a) Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“SEC. 514. LIMITATION ON THE GRANT OF EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.—(a) The aggregate original acquisition cost of excess defense articles ordered during the fiscal year 1975 under this chapter for foreign countries and international organizations shall not exceed \$150,000,000.

“(b) The value of any excess defense article furnished under this chapter to a foreign country or international organization by any agency of the United States Government shall be considered to be an expenditure made from funds appropriated under section 504 of this Act. Unless such agency certifies to the Comptroller General of the United States that the excess defense article it is ordering is not to be transferred by any means to a foreign country or international organization, when an order is placed for a defense article whose stock status is excess at the time ordered, a sum equal to the value thereof (less amounts to be transferred under section 632(d) of this Act) shall (1) be reserved and transferred to a suspense account, (2) remain in the suspense account until the excess defense article is either delivered to a foreign country or international organization or the order therefor is canceled, and (3) be transferred from the suspense account to (A) the general fund of the Treasury upon delivery of such article, or (B) the appropriation made under section 504 of this Act for the current fiscal year upon cancellation of the order. Such sum shall be transferred to the appropriation

made under section 504 of this Act for the current fiscal year, upon delivery of such article, if at the time of delivery the stock status of the article is determined in accordance with section 644 (g) or (m) of this Act to be nonexcess.

“(c) The President shall promptly and fully inform the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate of each decision to furnish on a grant basis to any country excess defense articles which are major weapons systems to the extent such major weapons system was not included in the presentation material previously submitted to the Congress. Additionally, the President shall also submit a quarterly report to the Congress listing by country the total value of all deliveries of excess defense articles, disclosing both the aggregate original acquisition cost and the aggregate value at the time of delivery.”

(b) Sections 8 and 11 of the Act entitled “An Act to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act, and for other purposes”, approved January 12, 1971 (84 Stat. 2053), as amended, are repealed.

STOCKPILING OF DEFENSE ARTICLES FOR FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Sec. 13. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 12 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“SEC. 515. STOCKPILING OF DEFENSE ARTICLES FOR FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds, other than funds made available under this chapter or section 401(a) of Public Law 89-387 (80 Stat. 37), or any subsequent corresponding legislation, may be obligated for the purpose of stockpiling any defense article or war reserve material, including the acquisition, storage, or maintenance of any war reserve equipment, secondary items, or munitions, if such article or material is set aside, reserved, or in any way earmarked or intended for future use by any foreign country under this Act or such section.

“(b) The cost of any such article or material set aside, reserved, or in any way earmarked or intended by the Department of Defense for future use by, for, or on behalf of the country referred to in section 401(a) (1) of Public Law 89-387 (80 Stat. 37) shall be charged against the limitation specified in such section or any subsequent corresponding legislation, for the fiscal year in which such article or material is set aside, reserved, or otherwise earmarked or intended; and the cost of any such article or material set aside, reserved, or in any way earmarked or intended for future use by, for, or on behalf of any other foreign country shall be charged against funds authorized under this chapter for the fiscal year in which such article or material is set aside, reserved, or otherwise earmarked. No such article or material may be made available to or for use by any foreign country unless such article or material has been charged against the limitation specified in such section, or any subsequent corresponding legislation, or against funds authorized under this chapter, as appropriate.”

MILITARY ASSISTANCE ADVISORY GROUPS AND MISSIONS

Sec. 14. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by sections 12(a) and 13 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“SEC. 516. MILITARY ASSISTANCE ADVISORY GROUPS AND MISSIONS.—Effective July 1, 1975, an amount equal to each sum expended under any provision of law, other than section 504 of this Act, with respect to any military assistance advisory group,

military mission, or other organization of the United States performing activities similar to such group or mission, shall be deducted from the funds made available under such section 504, and (1) if reimbursement of such amount is requested by the agency of the United States Government making the expenditure, reimbursed to that agency, or (2) if no such reimbursement is requested, deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.”

TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY

Sec. 15. (a) Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by sections 12, 13, and 14 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“SEC. 517. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—(a) (1) The President shall gradually reduce assistance (other than military training) provided under this chapter so that, not later than September 30, 1977, no assistance (other than military training) shall be provided under this chapter.

“(2) Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply to funds obligated prior to October 1, 1977.

“(b) For each of the fiscal years 1975, 1976, and 1977, the President is authorized to finance procurements of defense articles and defense services (other than military training) by any foreign country receiving defense articles or defense services during fiscal year 1974 under this chapter on terms providing for payment to the United States Government in United States dollars (1) of the value of such articles and services which value shall not exceed during each such fiscal year the value of such articles and services (other than military training) furnished that country in fiscal year 1974 under this chapter, (2) at a rate of interest of not less than four per centum a year, and (3) within ten years after delivery of the defense articles or rendering of the defense services.

“(c) (1) By not later than September 30, 1977, all the functions of a military assistance advisory group, a military mission, or other organization of the United States Government in a foreign country performing activities similar to any such group or mission, shall be transferred to the Chief of the United States Diplomatic Mission to that country. Upon the transfer of such functions, that group, mission, or organization, as the case may be, shall cease to exist.

“(2) On and after October 1, 1977, the total number of military attachés assigned or detailed to the United States Diplomatic Mission of a foreign country shall not exceed by more than twenty-five per centum the total number of military attachés authorized to be assigned or detailed to that mission on June 30, 1974.

“(3) On and after October 1, 1977, no military assistance advisory group, military mission, or other organization of the United States Government in a foreign country performing activities similar to any such group or mission, shall be established or continued unless such group, mission, or organization is authorized by law specifically for that country.”

(b) Effective October 1, 1977—

(1) the heading of chapter 1 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 1—PROVIDING MILITARY TRAINING”;

(2) sections 501, 502A, 514, and 516, and subsection (g) of section 644 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 are repealed;

(3) section 502 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out the caption “Utilization of Defense Articles and Services” and inserting in lieu thereof “Providing Military Training”, by striking out of the text “Defense articles and defense services” and inserting in lieu thereof “Mil-

itary training", and by striking out the last sentence;

(4) the heading of chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 2—MILITARY TRAINING";

(5) chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out sections 503 through 505 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 503. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized to furnish, on such terms and conditions consistent with this Act as the President may determine, military training to any foreign country or international organization. Funds for such training shall be appropriated for each fiscal year pursuant to authorization for that fiscal year. After September 30, 1977, no such training shall be conducted outside the United States except by specific authorization of law."

(6) section 511 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out of the section caption "Assistance" and inserting in lieu thereof "Training", and by striking out of the text "military assistance" and "such assistance" and inserting in lieu thereof "military training" and "such training", respectively;

(7) section 636(g)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "defense articles and defense services on a grant or sales basis" and inserting in lieu thereof "military training"; and

(8) section 644(m) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out subparagraph (1) and by striking out of subparagraphs (2) and (3) "nonexcess" wherever it appears.

TERMINATION OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO SOUTH KOREA

Sec. 16. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by sections 12(a), 13, 14, and 15(a) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 518. TERMINATION OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO SOUTH KOREA.—(a) The total of (1) the amount of funds obligated under this chapter to furnish assistance to South Korea, and (2) the value of excess defense articles furnished to South Korea under this chapter, shall not exceed—

"(A) \$91,500,000 during the fiscal year 1975;

"(B) \$61,000,000 during the fiscal year 1976; and

"(C) \$30,500,000 during the fiscal year 1977.

"(b) The aggregate total of credits extended, including participations in credits, and the principal amount of loans guaranteed under the Foreign Military Sales Act with respect to South Korea shall not exceed—

"(1) \$42,450,000 during the fiscal year 1975;

"(2) \$28,300,000 during the fiscal year 1976; and

"(3) \$14,150,000 during the fiscal year 1977.

"(c) On and after October 1, 1977, no assistance shall be furnished South Korea under this chapter, and no credits, including participations in credits, shall be extended, and no loans shall be guaranteed, under the Foreign Military Sales Act with respect to South Korea. The preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to funds obligated prior to such date."

SECURITY SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

Sec. 17. Section 532 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year 1974 not to exceed \$125,000,000, of which not less than \$50,000,000 shall be available solely for Israel" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$675,000,000".

TRANSFER BETWEEN ACCOUNTS

Sec. 18. (a) Section 610 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), immediately after "any other provision of this Act", insert "(except funds made available under chapter 2 of part II of this Act)".

(2) Add at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Any funds which the President has notified Congress pursuant to section 653 that he intends to provide in military assistance to any country may be transferred to, and consolidated with, any other funds he has notified Congress pursuant to such section that he intends to provide to that country for development assistance purposes."

(b) Section 614 of such Act is amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following: "The authority of this section shall not be used to waive the limitations on transfers contained in section 610(a) of this Act."

SUSPENSION OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

Sec. 19. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(x) All military assistance, all sales of defense articles and services (whether for cash or by credit, guarantee, or any other means), and all licenses with respect to the transportation of arms, ammunitions, and implements of war (including technical data relating thereto) to the Government of Turkey shall be suspended on the date of enactment of this subsection unless and until the President determines and certifies to the Congress that the Government of Turkey is in compliance with the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Foreign Military Sales Act, and any agreement entered into under such Acts, and that substantial progress toward agreement has been made regarding military forces in Cyprus."

Provided, That the President is authorized to suspend the provisions of this section and said Acts if he determines that such suspension will further negotiations for a peaceful solution of the Cyprus conflict. Any such suspension shall be effective only until thirty days after the convening of the Ninety-fourth Congress, and only if, during that time, Turkey shall observe the cease-fire and shall neither increase its forces on Cyprus nor transfer to Cyprus any United States supplied implements of war.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE

Sec. 20. Suspension 620 (v) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is repealed.

LIMITATION UPON ASSISTANCE TO OR FOR CHILE

Sec. 21. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total amount of assistance that may be made available for Chile under this or any other law during fiscal year 1975 may not exceed \$55,000,000, none of which may be made available for the purpose of providing military assistance (including security supporting assistance, sales, credit sales, or guarantees or the furnishing by any means of excess defense articles or items from stockpiles of the Department of Defense).

RECONSTRUCTION, RELIEF, AND REHABILITATION

Sec. 22. (a) Section 639B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any prohibitions or restrictions contained in this or any other Act, the President is authorized to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for reconstruction and economic development programs in the drought-stricken nations of Africa."

(b) The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding after section 639B a new section 639C as follows:

"SEC. 639C. RELIEF AND REHABILITATION IN BANGLADESH AND CYPRUS.—(a) The Congress

finds that the recent flooding in the People's Republic of Bangladesh, and the civil and international strife in the Republic of Cyprus, have caused great suffering and hardship for the peoples of the two Republics which cannot be alleviated with their internal resources. The President shall make every effort to develop and implement programs of relief and rehabilitation, in conjunction with other nations providing assistance, the United Nations, and other concerned international and regional organizations and voluntary agencies, to alleviate the hardships caused in these two nations.

"(b) Notwithstanding any prohibitions or restrictions contained in this or any other Act, the President is authorized to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for disaster relief, rehabilitation, and related programs in the People's Republic of Bangladesh and the Republic of Cyprus."

(c) The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding after section 639C, as added by subsection (b) of this section, the following new section:

"SEC. 639D. DISASTER RELIEF AND REHABILITATION.—Notwithstanding any prohibitions or restrictions contained in this or any other Act, the President is authorized to furnish assistance, on such terms and conditions as he may determine for disaster relief, rehabilitation, and related programs in the case of disasters that require large-scale relief and rehabilitation efforts which cannot be met adequately with the funds available for obligation under section 451 of this Act."

(d) The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding after section 639D, as added by subsection (c) of this section, the following new section:

"SEC. 639E. INTERNATIONALIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance for the purposes set forth in sections 639A, 639B, 639C, and 639D shall be distributed wherever practicable under the auspices of and by the United Nations and its specialized agencies, other international organizations or arrangements, multilateral institutions, and private voluntary agencies."

ACCESS TO CERTAIN MILITARY BASES ABROAD

Sec. 23. (a) Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 659. ACCESS TO CERTAIN MILITARY BASES ABROAD.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated for foreign assistance (including foreign military sales, credit sales, and guarantees) under any law may be used to provide any kind of assistance to any foreign country in which a military base is located if—

"(1) such base was constructed or is being maintained or operated with funds furnished by the United States; and

"(2) personnel of the United States carry out military operations from such base; unless and until the President has determined that the government of such country has, consistent with security authorized access, on a regular basis, to bona fide news media correspondents of the United States to such military base."

(b) Section 29 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973 is repealed.

PROHIBITING POLICE TRAINING

Sec. 24. (a) Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 23(a) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 660. PROHIBITING POLICE TRAINING.—(a) None of the funds made available to carry out this Act, and none of the local currencies generated under this Act, shall be used to provide training or advice, or provide any financial support, for police, prisons, or other law enforcement forces for

any foreign government or any program of internal intelligence or surveillance on behalf of any foreign government within the United States or abroad.

"(b) Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply—

"(1) with respect to assistance rendered under section 515(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, or with respect to any authority of the Drug Enforcement Administration or the Federal Bureau of Investigation which related to crimes of the nature which are unlawful under the laws of the United States; or

"(2) to any contract entered into prior to the date of enactment of this section with any person, organization, or agency of the United States Government to provide personnel to conduct, or assist in conducting, any such program.

Notwithstanding clause (2), subsection (a) shall apply to any renewal or extension of any contract referred to in such paragraph entered into on or after such date of enactment."

(b) Section 112 of such Act is repealed.

LIMITING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 25. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by sections 23(a) and 24 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 661. LIMITATIONS UPON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—(a) No funds appropriated under the authority of this or any other Act may be expended by or on behalf of the Central Intelligence Agency or any other agency of the United States Government for the conduct of operations in foreign countries pursuant to section 102(d)(5) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403), other than operations intended solely for obtaining necessary intelligence. Notwithstanding the foregoing limitation, the President may authorize and direct that any operation in a foreign country be resumed, or that any other operation in a foreign country be initiated, and funds may be expended therefor, if but not before, he (1) finds that such operation is important to the national security, and (2) transmits an appropriate report of his finding, together with an appropriate description of the nature and scope of such operation, to the committees of the Congress having jurisdiction to monitor and review the intelligence activities of the United States Government.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply during military operations by the United States under a declaration of war approved by the Congress or an exercise of powers by the President under the War Powers Resolution."

WAIVER OF PROHIBITION AGAINST ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES ENGAGING IN CERTAIN TRADE

Sec. 26. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by sections 24 and 25 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 662. WAIVER OF PROHIBITION AGAINST ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES ENGAGING IN CERTAIN TRADE.—Any provision of this Act or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 which prohibits assistance to a country because that country is engaging in trade with a designated country may be waived by the President if he determines that such waiver is in the national interest and reports such determination to the Congress."

POLICY WITH RESPECT TO INDOCHINA

Sec. 27. (a) The Congress finds that the cease-fire provided for in the Paris Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam has not been observed by any of the Vietnamese parties to the conflict. Military operations of an offensive and defensive nature continue throughout South Vietnam. In Cambodia, the civil war between insur-

gent forces and the Lon Nol government has intensified, resulting in widespread human suffering and the virtual destruction of the Cambodian economy.

(b) The Congress further finds that continuation of the military struggles in South Vietnam and Cambodia are not in the interest of the parties directly engaged in the conflicts, the people of Indochina, or world peace. In order to lessen the human suffering in Indochina and to bring about a genuine peace there, the Congress urges and requests the President and the Secretary of State to under take immediately the following measures:

(1) to initiate negotiations with representatives of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China to arrange a mutually agreed-upon and rapid de-escalation of military assistance on the part of the three principal suppliers of arms and material to all Vietnamese and Cambodian parties engaged in conflict;

(2) to urge by all available means that the Government of the Khmer Republic enter in negotiations with representatives of the Khmer Government of National Union for the purpose of arranging an immediate cease-fire and political settlement of the conflict; and to use all available means to establish contact with the Khmer Government of National Union and to urge them to participate in such negotiations. The United States should urge all Cambodian parties to use the good offices of the United Nations or a respected third country for the purpose of bringing an end to hostilities and reaching a political settlement;

(3) to utilize any public or private forum to negotiate directly with representatives of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Provisional Revolutionary Government, and the Republic of Vietnam to seek a new cease-fire in Vietnam and full compliance with the provisions of the Paris Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam, including a full accounting for Americans missing in Indochina;

(4) to reconvene the Paris Conference to seek full implementation of the provisions of the Agreement of January 27, 1973, on the part of all Vietnamese parties to the conflict; and

(5) to maintain regular and full consultation with the appropriate committees of the Congress and report to the Congress and the Nation at regular intervals on the progress toward obtaining a total cessation of hostilities in Indochina and a mutual reduction of military assistance to that area.

PRINCIPLES GOVERNING ECONOMIC AID TO INDOCHINA

Sec. 28. (a) Congress finds that, after expending over a billion dollars in funds for economic purposes in Indochina last year, and vast amounts in previous years, little in lasting economic benefit remains. A large proportion of the funds expended have been used for consumable items related to the war effort. Very little of our money has found its way into capital investments of a lasting productive benefit to the people. Congress calls upon the President and Secretary of State to take immediately the following actions designed to maximize the benefit of United States economic assistance:

(1) to organize a consortium to include multilateral financial institutions to help plan for Indochina reconstruction and development; to coordinate multilateral and bilateral contributions to the area's economic recovery; and to provide continuing advice to the recipient nations on the use of their own and outside resources;

(2) to develop, in coordination with the recipient governments, other donors, and the multilateral financial institutions, a comprehensive plan for Indochina reconstruction and economic development;

(3) to develop country-by-country reconstruction and development plans, including

detailed plans for the development of individual economic sectors, that can be used to identify and coordinate specific economic development projects and programs and to direct United States resources into areas of maximum benefits;

(4) to shift the emphasis of United States aid programs from consumption-oriented expenditures to economic development;

(5) to identify possible structural economic reforms in areas such as taxation, exchange rates, savings mechanisms, internal pricing, income distribution, land tenure, budgetary allocations and corruption, which should be undertaken if Indochinese economic development is to progress;

(6) to include in Indochina economic planning and programming specific performance criteria and standards which will enable the Congress and the executive branch to judge the adequacy of the recipients' efforts and to determine whether, and what amounts of, continued United States funding is justified; and

(7) to provide humanitarian assistance to Indochina wherever practicable under the auspices of and by the United Nations and its specialized agencies, other international organizations or arrangements, multilateral institutions, and private voluntary agencies with a minimum presence and activity of United States Government personnel.

(b) This section shall not be construed to imply continuation of a United States financial commitment beyond the authorization provided for in this Act or amendments made by this Act.

INDOCHINA POSTWAR RECONSTRUCTION

Sec. 29. Section 802 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 802. AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to furnish assistance for the relief and reconstruction of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos as authorized by this part, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for the fiscal year 1974 not to exceed \$504,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$617,000,000. Of the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1975—

"(1) \$449,900,000 shall be available only for the relief and reconstruction of South Vietnam in accordance with section 806 of this Act;

"(2) \$100,000,000 shall be available only for the relief and reconstruction of Cambodia in accordance with section 807 of this Act;

"(3) \$40,000,000 shall be available only for the relief and reconstruction of Laos in accordance with section 808 of this Act;

"(4) \$4,100,000 shall be available only for the regional development program;

"(5) \$16,000,000 shall be available only for support costs for the agency primarily responsible for carrying out this part; and

"(6) \$7,000,000 shall be available only for humanitarian assistance through international organizations. Such amounts are authorized to remain available until expended."

ASSISTANCE TO SOUTH VIETNAMESE CHILDREN

Sec. 30. Section 803 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), strike out "rights, particularly children fathered by United States citizens" and insert in lieu thereof "rights".

(2) In subsection (b), immediately after the second sentence, insert the following: "Of the sums made available for South Vietnam under section 802(1) of this Act for fiscal year 1975, \$10,000,000, or its equivalent in local currency, shall be available until expended solely to carry out this section."

LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Sec. 31. Part V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 806. LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO SOUTH VIETNAM.—(a) Notwithstanding any

other provision of law, no funds authorized to be appropriated by this or any other law may be obligated in any amount in excess of \$1,274,900,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, for the purpose of carrying out directly or indirectly any economic or military assistance, or any operation, project, or program of any kind, or for providing any goods, supplies, materials, equipment, services, personnel, or advisers in, to, for, or on behalf of South Vietnam. Of that amount, there shall be available during such fiscal year—

- "(1) \$700,000,000 for military assistance;
- "(2) \$125,000,000 only to carry out the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; and
- "(3) \$449,900,000 only for economic assistance of which there shall be available—
- "(A) \$90,000,000 for humanitarian assistance, of which there shall be available—
- "(i) \$70,000,000 for refugee relief;
- "(ii) \$10,000,000 for child care; and
- "(iii) \$10,000,000 for health care;
- "(B) \$154,500,000 for agricultural assistance, of which there shall be available—
- "(i) \$85,000,000 for fertilizer;
- "(ii) \$12,000,000 for POL (for agriculture);
- "(iii) \$6,000,000 for insecticides and pesticides;
- "(iv) \$10,000,000 for agricultural machinery and equipment (including spare parts);
- "(v) \$3,500,000 for agricultural advisory services;
- "(vi) \$20,000,000 for rural credit;
- "(vii) \$10,000,000 for canal dredging;
- "(viii) \$4,000,000 for low-lift pumps; and
- "(ix) \$4,000,000 for fish farm development;
- "(C) \$139,800,000 for industrial development assistance, of which there shall be available—

- "(i) \$124,000,000 for commodities;
- "(ii) \$10,000,000 for industrial credit; and
- "(iii) \$5,800,000 for industrial advisory services (including feasibility studies);
- "(D) \$65,600,000 for miscellaneous assistance, of which there shall be available—
- "(i) \$47,900,000 for the service sector (including POL, machinery, equipment, and spare parts); and
- "(ii) \$17,700,000 for technical services and operating expenses.

"(b) (1) No funds made available under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) may be transferred to, or consolidated with, the funds made available under any other paragraph of such subsection, nor may more than 20 per centum of the funds made available under subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of this section be transferred to, or consolidated with, the funds made available under any such subparagraph.

"(2) Whenever the President determines it to be necessary in carrying out this part, any funds made available under any clause of subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of subsection (a) of this section may be transferred to, and consolidated with, the funds made available under any other clause of that same subparagraph.

"(3) The President shall fully inform the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of each transfer he intends to make under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection prior to making such transfer.

"(c) In computing the \$1,274,900,000 limitation on obligational authority under subsection (a) of this section with respect to such fiscal year, there shall be included in the computation the value of any goods, supplies, materials, equipment, services, personnel, or advisers provided to, for, or on behalf of South Vietnam in such fiscal year by gift, donation, loan, lease, or otherwise. For the purpose of this subsection, 'value' means the fair market value of any goods, supplies, materials, or equipment provided to, for, or on behalf of South Vietnam but in no case

less than 33½ per centum of the amount the United States paid at the time such goods, supplies, materials, or equipment were acquired by the United States.

"(d) No funds may be obligated for any of the purposes described in subsection (a) of this section in, to, for, or on behalf of South Vietnam in any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1975, unless such funds have been specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this section. In no case shall funds in any amount in excess of the amount specifically authorized by law for any fiscal year be obligated for any such purpose during such fiscal year.

"(e) After the date of enactment of this section, whenever any request is made to the Congress for the appropriation of funds for use in, to, for, or on behalf of South Vietnam for any fiscal year, the President shall furnish a written report to the Congress explaining the purpose for which such funds are to be used in such fiscal year.

"(f) The President shall submit to the Congress within thirty days after the end of each quarter of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1974, a written report showing the total amount of funds obligated in, to, for, or on behalf of South Vietnam during the preceding quarter by the United States Government, and shall include in such report a general breakdown of the total amount obligated, describing the different purposes for which such funds were obligated and the total amount obligated for such purpose.

"(g) (1) Effective six months after the date of enactment of this section, the total number of civilian officers and employees, including contract employees, of executive agencies of the United States Government who are citizens of the United States and of members of the Armed Forces of the United States present in South Vietnam shall not at any one time exceed four thousand, not more than two thousand five hundred of whom shall be members of such armed forces and direct hire and contract employees of the Department of Defense. Effective one year after the date of enactment of this section, such total number shall not exceed at any one time three thousand, not more than one thousand five hundred of whom shall be members of such armed forces and direct hire and contract employees of the Department of Defense.

"(2) Effective six months after the date of enactment of this section, the United States shall not, at any one time, pay in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, the compensation or allowances of more than eight hundred individuals in South Vietnam who are citizens of countries other than South Vietnam or the United States. Effective one year after the date of enactment of this section, the total number of individuals whose compensation or allowance is so paid shall not exceed at any one time five hundred.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, 'executive agency of the United States Government' means any agency, department, board, wholly or partly owned corporation, instrumentality, commission, or establishment within the executive branch of the United States Government.

"(4) This subsection shall not be construed to apply with respect to any individual in South Vietnam who (A) is an employee or volunteer worker of a voluntary private, nonprofit relief organization or is an employee or volunteer worker of the International Committee of the Red Cross, and (B) engages only in activities providing humanitarian assistance in South Vietnam.

"(h) This section shall not be construed as a commitment by the United States to South Vietnam for its defense."

LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO CAMBODIA

SEC. 32. (a) Part V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by section 81 of

this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 807. LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO CAMBODIA.—(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds authorized to be appropriated by this or any other law may be obligated in any amount in excess of \$377,000,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, for the purpose of carrying out directly or indirectly any economic or military assistance, or any operation, project, or program of any kind, or for providing any goods, supplies, materials, equipment, services, personnel, or advisers in, to, for, or on behalf of Cambodia. Of that amount there shall be available—

- "(1) \$200,000,000 for military assistance;
- "(2) \$77,000,000 only to carry out the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; and
- "(3) \$100,000,000 only for economic assistance, of which there shall be available—
- "(A) \$20,000,000 for humanitarian assistance;
- "(B) \$63,000,000 for commodity import assistance;
- "(C) \$15,000,000 for multilateral stabilization assistance; and
- "(D) \$2,000,000 for technical support and participant training.

"(b) No funds made available under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) of this section may be transferred to, or consolidated with, the funds made available under any other paragraph of such subsection, nor may more than 20 per centum of the funds made available under any subparagraph of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of this section be transferred to, or consolidated with, the funds made available under any other such subparagraph.

"(c) In computing the \$377,000,000 limitation on obligation authority under subsection (a) of this section with respect to such fiscal year, there shall be included in the computation the value of any goods, supplies, materials, equipment, services, personnel, or advisers provided to, for, or on behalf of Cambodia in such fiscal year by gift, donation, loan, lease or otherwise. For the purpose of this subsection, 'value' means the fair market value of any goods, supplies, materials, or equipment provided to, for, or on behalf of Cambodia but in no case less than 33½ per centum of the amount the United States paid at the time such goods, supplies, materials, or equipment were acquired by the United States.

"(d) No funds may be obligated for any of the purposes described in subsection (a) of this section in, to, for, or on behalf of Cambodia in any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1975, unless such funds have been specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this section. In no case shall funds in any amount in excess of the amount specifically authorized by law for any fiscal year be obligated for any such purpose during such fiscal year.

"(e) After the date of enactment of this section, whenever any request is made to the Congress for the appropriation of funds for use in, to, for, or on behalf of Cambodia for any fiscal year, the President shall furnish a written report to the Congress explaining the purpose for which such funds are to be used in such fiscal year.

"(f) The President shall submit to the Congress within thirty days after the end of each quarter of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1974, a written report showing the total amount of funds obligated in, to, for, or on behalf of Cambodia during the preceding quarter by the United States Government, and shall include in such report a general breakdown of the total amount obligated, describing the different purposes for which such funds were

obligated and the total amount obligated for such purpose.

"(g) (1) The total number of civilian officers and employees of executive agencies of the United States Government who are citizens of the United States and of members of the Armed Forces of the United States (excluding such members while actually engaged in air operations in or over Cambodia which originate outside Cambodia) present in Cambodia at any one time shall not exceed two hundred.

"(2) The United States shall not, at any one time, pay in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, the compensation or allowances of more than eighty-five individuals in Cambodia who are citizens of countries other than Cambodia or the United States.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, 'executive agency of the United States Government' means any agency, department, board, wholly or partly owned corporation, instrumentality, commission, or establishment within the executive branch of the United States Government.

"(4) This subsection shall not be construed to apply with respect to any individual in Cambodia who (A) is an employee or volunteer worker of a voluntary private, non-profit relief organization or is an employee or volunteer worker of the International Committee of the Red Cross, and (B) engages only in activities providing humanitarian assistance in Cambodia.

"(h) This section shall not be construed as a commitment by the United States to Cambodia for its defense."

(b) Sections 655 and 656 of such Act are repealed.

LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO LAOS

SEC. 33. Part V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by sections 31 and 32(a) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 808. LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO LAOS.—(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds authorized to be appropriated by this or any other law may be obligated in any amount in excess of \$70,000,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, for the purpose of carrying out directly or indirectly any economic or military assistance, or any operation, project, or program of any kind, or for providing any goods, supplies, materials, equipment, services, personnel, or advisers in, to, for, or on behalf of Laos. Of that amount, there shall be available—

"(1) \$30,000,000 for military assistance; and

"(2) \$40,000,000 only for economic assistance, of which there shall be available—

"(A) \$11,000,000 for humanitarian assistance;

"(B) \$6,500,000 for reconstruction and development assistance;

"(C) \$16,100,000 for stabilization assistance; and

"(D) \$6,400,000 for technical support.

"(b) No funds made available under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section may be transferred to, or consolidated with, the funds made available under paragraph (1) of such subsection, nor may more than 20 per centum of the funds made available under any subparagraph of paragraph (2) be transferred to, or consolidated with, the funds made available under any other such subparagraph.

"(c) In computing the limitations on obligation authority under subsection (a) of this section with respect to such fiscal year, there shall be included in the computation the value of any goods, supplies, materials, equipment, services, personnel, or advisers provided to, for, or on behalf of Laos in such fiscal year by gift, donation, loan, lease, or otherwise. For the purpose of this sub-

section, 'value' means the fair market value of any goods, supplies, materials, or equipment provided to, for, or on behalf of Laos but in no case less than 33½ per centum of the amount the United States paid at the time such goods, supplies, materials, or equipment were acquired by the United States.

"(d) No funds may be obligated for any of the purposes described in subsection (a) of this section in, to, for, or on behalf of Laos in any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1975, unless such funds have been specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this section. In no case shall funds in any amount in excess of the amount specifically authorized by law for any fiscal year be obligated for any such purpose during such fiscal year.

"(e) After the date of enactment of this section, whenever any request is made to the Congress for the appropriation of funds for use in, to, for, or on behalf of Laos, for any fiscal year, the President shall furnish a written report to the Congress explaining the purpose for which such funds are to be used in such fiscal year.

"(f) The President shall submit to the Congress within thirty days after the end of each quarter of each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1974, a written report showing the total amount of funds obligated in, to, for, or on behalf of Laos during the preceding quarter by the United States Government and shall include in such report a general breakdown of the total amount obligated, describing the different purposes for which such funds were obligated and the total amount obligated for such purpose.

"(g) This section shall not be construed as a commitment by the United States to Laos for its defense."

POPULATION, NARCOTICS, INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN AND REGIONAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 34. Part V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by sections 31, 32(a), and 33 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 809. POPULATION, NARCOTICS, INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN AND REGIONAL PROGRAMS.—The provisions of sections 806, 807, and 808 shall not apply to: (1) funds obligated for purposes of title X of chapter 2 of part I (programs relating to population growth); (2) funds made available under section 482 (programs relating to narcotics control); (3) funds made available under section 802(6) (humanitarian assistance through international organizations); or (4) funds obligated for regional programs."

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 35. Part V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by sections 31, 32(a), 33, and 34 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 810. TRANSFER OF FUNDS. (a) The authority of section 610 of this Act shall not apply with respect to any funds made available to South Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos.

"(b) Any funds made available under any provision of this or any other law for the purpose of providing military assistance for South Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia may be transferred to, and consolidated with, any funds made available to that country for war relief, reconstruction, or general economic development."

MIDDLE EAST ASSISTANCE

SEC. 36. (a) The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART VI

"SEC. 901. GENERAL AUTHORITY FOR ASSISTANCE TO THE MIDDLE EAST.—The President is authorized to furnish assistance authorized

by this Act, and to provide credits and guarantees authorized by the Foreign Military Sales Act. Any such assistance, credits, and guarantees shall be provided in accordance with all the provisions applicable to that type of assistance under this Act and applicable to credits and guarantees under the Foreign Military Sales Act.

"SEC. 902. ALLOCATIONS.—(a) Of the funds appropriated to carry out chapter 2 of part II of this Act during the fiscal year 1975, not to exceed \$100,000,000 may be made available for military assistance in the Middle East.

"(b) Of the funds appropriated to carry out chapter 4 of part II of this Act during the fiscal year 1975, not to exceed \$667,500,000 may be made available for security supporting assistance in the Middle East.

"(c) Of the aggregate ceiling on credits and guarantees established by section 31(b) of the Foreign Military Sales Act during the fiscal year 1975, not to exceed \$330,000,000 shall be available for countries in the Middle East.

"SEC. 903. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FUND.—

(a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$100,000,000 to meet special requirements arising from time to time in the Middle East for the purpose of providing any type of assistance authorized by part I of this Act, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purpose. The funds authorized to be appropriated by this section shall be available for use by the President for assistance authorized by this Act in accordance with the provisions applicable to the furnishing of such assistance. Such funds are authorized to remain available until expended.

"(b) The President shall keep the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives currently informed on the programming and obligation of funds under subsection (a).

"(c) (1) Prior to obligating any amount for a project in excess of \$1,000,000 from funds made available under this section, the President shall transmit a written report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on the same day giving a complete explanation with respect to such proposed obligation. Each report shall include an explanation relating to only one project.

"(2) The President may make such obligation thirty days after the report has been so transmitted unless, before the end of the first period of thirty calendar days after the date on which the report is transmitted, a resolution is adopted disapproving the proposed obligation with respect to which the report is made.

"(3) Paragraphs (4) through (11) of this subsection are enacted by Congress—

"(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in the House in the case of resolutions described by this subsection; and they supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

"(4) For purposes of paragraphs (2) through (12) of this subsection, 'resolution' means only a concurrent resolution, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the Congress does not approve the obligation for _____ and explained in the report transmitted to Congress

by the President on ———, 19—, the first blank space therein being filled with the name of the foreign country or organization on whose behalf the obligation is to be incurred, and the other blank spaces therein being appropriately filled with the date of the transmittal of the report; but does not include a resolution specifying obligations for more than one proposed project.

"(5) If the committee, to which has been referred a resolution disapproving a proposed obligation, has not reported the resolution at the end of ten calendar days after its introduction, it is in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to the same obligation which has been referred to the committee.

"(6) A motion to discharge may be made only by an individual favoring the resolution, is highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same proposed obligation), and debate thereon is limited to not more than one hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(7) If the motion to discharge is agreed to, or disagreed to, the motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same obligation.

"(8) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to an obligation, it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. The motion is highly privileged and is not debatable. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(9) Debate on the resolution is limited to not more than two hours, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate is not debatable. An amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(10) Motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to an obligation, and motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, are decided without debate.

"(11) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to an obligation are decided without debate.

"(12) If, prior to the passage by one House of a concurrent resolution of that House, that House receives from the other House a concurrent resolution of such other House, then—

"(A) the procedure with respect to the concurrent resolution of the first House shall be the same as if no concurrent resolution from the other House had been received; but

"(B) on any vote on final passage of the concurrent resolution of the first House the concurrent resolution from the other House shall be automatically substituted."

(b) Section 620 (p) of such Act is repealed.

FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT AMENDMENTS

Sec. 37. (a) The Foreign Military Sales Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 3(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) A country shall remain ineligible in accordance with subsection (c) of this section until such time as the President determines that such violation has ceased, that the country concerned has given assurances satisfactory to the President that such violation will not recur, and that, if such violation involved the transfer of sophisticated weapons without the consent of the President, such weapons have been returned to the country concerned."

(2) Section 22 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) No sales of defense articles shall be made to the government of any economically developed country under the provisions of this section if such articles are generally available for purchase by such country from commercial sources in the United States."

(3) Section 23 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23. CREDIT SALES.—The President is authorized to finance procurements of defense articles and defense services by friendly foreign countries and international organizations on terms requiring the payment to the United States Government in United States dollars of—

"(1) the value of such articles or services within a period not to exceed ten years after the delivery of such articles or the rendering of such services; and

"(2) interest on the unpaid balance of that obligation for payment of the value of such articles or services, at a rate equivalent to the current average interest rate, as of the last day of the month preceding the financing of such procurement, that the United States Government pays on outstanding marketable obligations of comparable maturity, unless the President certifies to Congress that the national interest requires a lesser rate of interest and states in the certification the lesser rate so required and the justification therefor."

(4) In subsections (a) and (b) of section 24, the parenthetical phrase in each is amended to read as follows: "(excluding United States Government agencies other than the Federal Financing Bank)".

(5) Section 24(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Funds made available to carry out this Act shall be obligated in an amount equal to 25 per centum of the principal amount of contractual liability related to any guaranty issued prior to July 1, 1974, under this section. Funds made available to carry out this Act shall be obligated in an amount equal to 10 per centum of the principal amount of contractual liability related to any guaranty issued after June 30, 1974, under this section. All funds so obligated shall constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims under such guaranties and only such of the funds in the reserve as may be in excess from time to time of the total principal amount of contractual liability related to all outstanding guaranties under this section shall be deobligated and transferred to the general fund of the Treasury. Any guaranties issued hereunder shall be backed by the full faith and credit of the United States."

(6) Section 24 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d) The President may guarantee under this section only those payments for any defense article or defensive service which are due within ten years after that defense article is delivered or that defense service is rendered, except that such guaranty may be made for not more than twenty years if the President certifies to Congress that the national interest requires that the period of guaranty be longer than ten years, and states in the certification the country or international organization on whose behalf the

guaranty is to be made, the period of the guaranty, and the justification for the longer period."

(7) (A) At the end of chapter 1 add the following new section:

"SEC. 25. QUARTERLY REPORTS; CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL.—(a) Not later than fifteen days after the end of each quarter, the President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report setting forth the total amount of cash sales from stock under section 21, contracts for the procurement of defense articles or defense services under section 22, credit sales under section 23 of this Act, and guaranties under section 24 of this Act made during the preceding quarter, and the country or international organization to which such sale, credit sale, or guaranty is made or expected to be made.

"(b) (1) The President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on the same day a written statement giving a complete explanation with respect to any agreement or contract to sell or to extend credit or guaranties if—

"(A) the amount of such sale, credit sale, or guaranty exceeds \$25,000,000; or

"(B) the amount of such sale, credit sale, or guaranty, when added to the amount of all the sales, credit sales, and guaranties made to that country or international organization in that fiscal year (including the amount of any sale, credit sale, and guaranty made to that country or international organization under a statement of waiver in accordance with subsection (c) of this section), causes the total amount of sales, credit sales, and guaranties made to that country in that year to exceed \$50,000,000 for the first time.

Each such statement shall include an explanation relating to only one agreement or contract to sell or to extend credit or guaranties, and shall set forth—

"(i) the country or international organization to which the sale, credit sale, or guaranty is made;

"(ii) the amount of the sale, credit sale, or guaranty;

"(iii) in the case of a sale, a description of the defense article or service provided;

"(iv) the department, agency, or branch of the United States Armed Forces entering into such contract or agreement; and

"(v) the date of such agreement or contract.

"(2) (A) No sale, credit sale, or guaranty may be made under such agreement or contract until the end of the first period of thirty calendar days of continuous session of Congress after the date on which the statement is transmitted.

"(B) The President may make such sale, credit sale, or guaranty thirty days after the statement has been so transmitted unless, before the end of the first period of thirty calendar days of continuous session of Congress after the date on which the statement is transmitted, Congress adopts a concurrent resolution disapproving the sale, credit sale, or guaranty with respect to which the statement is made.

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (2) of this subsection—

"(A) the continuity of a session is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; and

"(B) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the thirty-day period.

"(c) The provisions of paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of this section shall not apply if the President transmits to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a

statement of waiver in which he certifies that an emergency exists which requires such waiver in the national security interests of the United States.

"(d) Subsections (a) through (m) of this section are enacted by Congress—

"(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in the House in the case of resolutions described by this section; and they supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

"(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

"(e) For purposes of subsections (d) through (m) of this section, 'resolution' means only a concurrent resolution, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That the Congress does not approve the (agreement, contract) for _____ and explained in the statement transmitted to Congress by the President on _____, 19____, the appropriate word within the parentheses being selected, the first blank space therein being filled with the name of the foreign country on whose behalf the sale, credit sale, or guaranty is made, and the other blank space therein being appropriately filled with the date of the transmittal of the statement; but does not include a resolution specifying more than one sale, credit sale, or guaranty.

"(f) If the committee, to which has been referred a resolution disapproving a sale, credit sale, or guaranty, has not reported the resolution at the end of ten calendar days after its introduction, it is in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of the resolution or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to the same sale, credit sale, or guaranty which has been referred to the committee.

"(g) A motion to discharge may be made only by an individual favoring the resolution, is highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same sale, credit sale, or guaranty), and debate thereon is limited to not more than one hour, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(h) If the motion to discharge is agreed to, or disagreed to, the motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same sale, credit sale, or guaranty.

"(i) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a sale, credit sale, or guaranty, it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. The motion is highly privileged and is not debatable. An amendment to the motion is not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(j) Debate on the resolution is limited to not more than two hours, to be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate is not debatable. An amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution is

not in order, and it is not in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

"(k) Motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or to consideration of, a resolution with respect to a sale, credit sale, or guaranty, and motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, are decided without debate.

"(l) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a sale, credit sale, or guaranty are decided without debate.

"(m) If, prior to the passage by one House of a concurrent resolution of that House, that House receives from the other House a concurrent resolution of such other House, then—

"(1) the procedure with respect to the concurrent resolution of the first House shall be the same as if no concurrent resolution from the other House had been received; but

"(2) on any vote on final passage of the concurrent resolution of the first House the concurrent resolution from the other House shall be automatically substituted."

(B) Section 35(b) of such Act is repealed.

(8) In section 31—

(A) in subsection (a), strike out "\$325,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974" and insert in lieu thereof "\$450,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975"; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) strike out "\$730,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974" and insert in lieu thereof "\$872,500,000 for the fiscal year 1975"; and

(ii) add at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Of the funds made available under subsection (a) of this section, \$100,000,000 shall first be obligated with respect to financing the procurement of defense articles and defense services by Israel under section 23 of this Act, except that Israel shall be released from contractual liability to repay the United States Government for the defense articles and defense services so financed."

(b) Obligations initially charged against appropriations made available for purposes authorized by section 31(a) of the Foreign Military Sales Act after June 30, 1974, and prior to the enactment of the amendment of that Act by paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of this section in an amount equal to 25 per centum of the principal amount of contractual liability related to guarantees issued pursuant to section 24(a) of that Act shall be adjusted to reflect such amendment with proper credit to the appropriations made available in the fiscal year 1975 to carry out that Act.

POLITICAL PRISONERS

SEC. 38. Section 32 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Commencing with respect to 1974, the President shall submit annually to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a written report setting forth fully the steps he has taken to carry out this section."

GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE

SEC. 39. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial", approved May 7, 1928, as amended (22 U.S.C. 278), is amended by striking out "\$500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000".

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF CONTROL AND SUPERVISION IN VIETNAM

SEC. 40. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$16,528,000 for payments by the United States to help

meet expenses of the International Commission of Control and Supervision in Vietnam. Funds appropriated under this subsection are authorized to be made available for reimbursement to the Agency for International Development of amounts expended by the Agency during fiscal year 1975 as interim United States payments to help meet expenses of the International Commission of Control and Supervision.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State not to exceed \$11,200,000 for reimbursement to the Agency for International Development of amounts expended by the Agency for International Development to help meet expenses of the International Commission on Control and Supervision in fiscal year 1974.

(c) * Reimbursements received by the Agency for International Development under this section may be credited to applicable appropriations of the Agency and shall be available for the purposes for which such appropriations are authorized to be used during fiscal year 1975.

POLICY ON ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA

SEC. 41. The President is requested to review the regional allocation of economic development assistance and to increase Africa's share of the Agency for International Development loans and grants. Per capita official development assistance to the developing countries of Africa, including both United States bilateral assistance and United States contributions to multilateral lending institutions, should be raised to a level at least equal to those for Asia and Latin America. A special effort should be made to provide more assistance to the sixteen of the world's twenty-five least developed countries that are in Africa and to the fourteen African nations that are judged to be most seriously affected by rising costs of food and fuel. The President is requested to make a report to Congress on action taken to provide the developing countries of Africa with an equitable share of United States economic assistance at the time that the Agency for International Development's operational year budget for fiscal year 1975 is submitted to Congress and again with the submission to Congress of the proposed Agency for International Development budget for fiscal year 1976.

POLICY ON THE INDEPENDENCE OF ANGOLA, MOZAMBIQUE, AND GUINEA-BISSAU

SEC. 42. (a) (1) Congress finds that the Government of Portugal's recognition of the right to independence of the African territories of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau marks a significant advance toward the goal of self-determination for all the peoples of Africa, without which peace on the continent is not secure.

(2) Congress finds that progress toward independence for the Portuguese Government and African leaders on the timing and nature of progress toward independence are being conducted with the aim of bringing permanent peace and stability to these countries and of guaranteeing the human rights of all their citizens.

(3) Congress finds that progress toward independence for the Portuguese African territories will have a significant impact on the international organizations and the community of nations.

(4) Congress commends the Portuguese Government's initiatives on these fronts as evidence of a reaffirmation of that Government's support for her obligations under both the United Nations Charter and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(b) Therefore, Congress calls upon the President and the Secretary of State to take the following actions designed to make clear United States support for a peaceful

December 11, 1974

H 11648

and orderly transition to independence in the Portuguese African territories:

(1) An official statement should be issued of United States support for the independence of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau, and of our desire to have good relations with the future governments of the countries.

(2) It should be made clear to the Government of Portugal that we view the efforts toward a peaceful and just settlement of the conflict in the African territories as consistent with Portugal's obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization partnership.

(3) The United States should encourage United Nations support for a peaceful transition to independence, negotiated settlement of all differences, and the protection of human rights of all citizens of the three territories.

(4) The United States should open a dialog with potential leaders of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau and assure them of our commitment to their genuine political and economic independence.

(5) The economic development needs of the three territories will be immense when independence is achieved. Therefore, it is urged that the United States Agency for International Development devote immediate attention to assessing the economic situation in Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau and be ready to cooperate with the future governments in providing the kind of assistance that will help make their independence viable. In addition, the United States Government should take the initiative among other donors, both bilateral and multilateral, in seeking significant contribution of development assistance for the three territories.

(6) In light of the need of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau for skilled and educated manpower, a priority consideration should be given to expanding immediately current United States programs of educational assistance to the territories as a timely and substantive contribution to their independence.

(c) Reports should be submitted to the Congress on the implementation of the proposals set forth in subsection (b) and Congress should be kept fully informed on developments in United States policy toward the independence of the Portuguese African territories.

(d) Since it is in the national interest of the United States to maintain and strengthen close relations with the independent nations of Africa, the Congress believes the positive initiatives should be undertaken without delay.

CONVENTIONAL ARMS TRADE

SEC. 43. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that the recent growth in international transfers of conventional arms to developing nations—

(1) is a cause for grave concern for the United States and other nations in that in particular areas of the world it increases the danger of potential violence among nations, and diverts scarce world resources from more peaceful uses; and

(2) could be controlled progressively through negotiations and agreements among supplier and recipient nations.

(b) Therefore, the President is urged to propose to the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament that it considers as a high priority agenda item discussions among participating nations of that Conference for the purposes of—

(1) agreeing to workable limitations on conventional arms transfers; and

(2) establishing a mechanism through which such limitations could be effectively monitored.

(c) The President shall transmit to the Congress not later than six months after the enactment of this Act a report setting forth the steps he has taken to carry out this section.

CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

SEC. 44. (a) The President is authorized to transmit to the Caribbean Development Bank an instrument stating that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has the authority to conclude an agreement of accession with such bank and to assume rights and obligations pursuant to such agreement. However, such agreement shall be subject to the prior approval of the President.

(b) The instrument transmitted by the President to the Caribbean Development Bank under subsection (a) shall state that the United States shall not assume any financial or other responsibility for the performance of any obligation incurred by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico pursuant to such agreement of accession or pursuant to any other aspect of its membership or participation in such bank.

(c) Such agreement of accession shall provide that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico may not receive from the Caribbean Development Bank any funds provided to the bank by the United States.

EXPENSE OF UNITED STATES MEMBERSHIP IN UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

SEC. 45. No funds authorized to be appropriated under this or any other law may be made available to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization until the Secretary of State certifies that each resolution passed by such Organization not of an educational, scientific, or cultural character has been repealed.

LIMITATION ON CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

SEC. 46. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, total contributions authorized herein to the United Nations or to any segment or subdivision of this world organization shall not exceed \$165,000,000.

ASSISTANCE TO PORTUGAL AND PORTUGUESE COLONIES IN AFRICA GAINING INDEPENDENCE

SEC. 47. Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"CHAPTER X—ASSISTANCE TO PORTUGAL AND PORTUGUESE COLONIES IN AFRICA GAINING INDEPENDENCE

"SEC. 496. ASSISTANCE TO PORTUGAL AND PORTUGUESE COLONIES IN AFRICA GAINING INDEPENDENCE.—(a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1975, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, not to exceed—

"(1) \$5,000,000 to make grants; and
 "(2) \$50,000,000 to make loans;
 to remain available until expended, for use by the President in providing economic assistance, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for Portugal and the countries and colonies in Africa which were, prior to April 25, 1974, colonies of Portugal. Of such assistance, not more than 50 per centum shall be furnished to Portugal.

"(b) It is the sense of the Congress that the new government in Portugal should be commended for its commitment to independence for Portuguese African colonies. The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to support the democratic experiment in Portugal, and the independent development of the nations emerging in Africa."

INTEGRATION OF WOMEN

SEC. 48. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 305. INTEGRATION OF WOMEN.—The President is requested to instruct each representative of the United States to each international organization of which the United States is a member (including but not limited to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) to carry out their duties with respect to such organizations in such a manner as to encourage and promote the integration of women into the national economies of member and recipient countries and into professional and policymaking positions within such organizations, thereby improving the status of women."

POLICY WITH RESPECT TO COUNTRIES MOST SERIOUSLY AFFECTED BY FOOD SHORTAGES

SEC. 49. (a) The Congress finds that tight food availabilities throughout the world threatens the citizens of many countries with serious hunger and malnutrition. While in the past foreign policy considerations have represented a significant factor in the allocation of available food and fertilizer assistance, the current food emergency requires an immediate reordering of priorities under which such assistance is distributed worldwide. The United Nations has designated thirty-two countries as "Most Seriously Affected" by the current economic crisis. These are countries without the internal food production capability nor the foreign exchange availability to secure food to meet their immediate food requirements. The Congress calls upon the President and Secretary of State to take immediately the following actions designed to mobilize all appropriate resources to meet the food emergency:

(1) Immediately review and make appropriate adjustments in the level of programming our food and fertilizer assistance programs to make the maximum feasible volume of food and fertilizer available to those countries most seriously affected by current food shortages.

(2) Call upon all traditional and potential new donors of food, fertilizer, or the means of financing these commodities to immediately increase their participation in efforts to address the emergency food needs of the developing world.

(3) Make available to these most seriously affected countries the maximum feasible volume of food commodities, within appropriate regard to the current domestic price and supply situations.

(4) Maintain regular and full consultation with the appropriate committees of the Congress and report to the Congress and the Nation on steps which are being taken to meet this food emergency. In accordance with this provision, the President shall report to the Congress on the following: (A) a global assessment by country of food needs for fiscal year 1975, specifying expected food grain deficits by country and current arrangements for meeting such deficits; (B) currently planned programming of commodities under Public Law 480 by country and within such country, by volume and commodity and; (C) steps which are being taken to encourage other countries to increase their participation in food assistance or the financing of food assistance. Such report should reach the Congress within thirty days of enactment of this Act and should be supplemented quarterly for the remainder of fiscal year 1975.

(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds authorized to be appropriated by this or any other law may be obligated in any amount in excess of \$350,000,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, for the purpose of providing concessional

December 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

food aid assistance, or in excess of \$90,000,000 for the purpose of providing fertilizer under our foreign assistance programs, unless such funds are used to purchase commodities for countries "Most Seriously Affected" by the economic crisis as designated by the United Nations, or unless the President demonstrates to the appropriate committees of the Congress that the use of such funds to purchase food assistance is solely for humanitarian food purposes.

(6) The Congress calls upon the President to proceed immediately with the implementation of resolutions and recommendations adopted by the World Food Conference. The Congress firmly believes that it is incumbent upon the United States to take a leading role in assisting in the development of a viable and coherent world food policy which would begin the task of alleviating widespread hunger and suffering prevalent in famine-stricken nations. The President shall report to the Congress within ninety days of enactment of this Act on the implementation of the resolutions and the extent to which the United States is participating in the implementation of resolutions adopted at the World Food Conference.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MORGAN

The CLERK. Mr. MORGAN moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3394 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 17234, as passed, as follows:

That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Assistance Act of 1974".

TITLE I—MIDDLE EAST PEACE

ASSISTANCE TO THE MIDDLE EAST

SEC. 2. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART VI

"SEC. 901. STATEMENT OF POLICY.—The Congress recognizes that a peaceful and lasting resolution of the divisive issues that have contributed to tension and conflict between nations in the Middle East is essential to the security of the United States and the cause of world peace. The Congress declares and finds that the United States can and should play a constructive role in securing a just and durable peace in the Middle East by facilitating increased understanding between the Arab nations and Israel, and by assisting the nations in the area in their efforts to achieve economic progress and political stability, which are the essential foundations for a just and durable peace. It is the sense of Congress that United States assistance programs in the Middle East should be designed to promote mutual respect and security among the nations in the area and to foster a climate conducive to increased economic development, thereby contributing to a community of free, secure, and prospering nations in the Middle East.

"It is further the sense of Congress that none of the funds authorized by this Act should be provided to any nation which denies its citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate.

"SEC. 902. ALLOCATIONS.—(a) Of the funds appropriated to carry out chapter 2 of part II of this Act, during the fiscal year 1975 up to \$200,000,000 may be made available for military assistance in the Middle East, of which not less than \$100,000,000 shall be made available for Israel.

"(b) Of the funds appropriated to carry out chapter 4 of part II of this Act, during the fiscal year 1975 up to \$577,500,000 may be made available for security supporting assistance in the Middle East, of which not less than \$250,000,000 shall be made available for Israel and not less than \$250,000,000 shall be made available for Egypt.

"(c) Of the aggregate ceiling on credits

and guaranties established by section 31(b) of the Foreign Military Sales Act, during the fiscal year 1975 up to \$230,000,000 shall be available for countries in the Middle East, of which not less than \$200,000,000 shall be made available for Israel.

"SEC. 903. (a) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS FUND.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$100,000,000 to furnish assistance under part I of this Act to meet special requirements arising from time to time in carrying out the purposes of this part, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes. The funds authorized to be appropriated by this section shall be available for use by the President for assistance authorized by such part in accordance with the provisions applicable to the furnishing of such assistance. Such funds are authorized to remain available until expended.

"(b) The President may only obligate or expend, for each foreign country or international organization, funds authorized under this section—

"(1) after he reports to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate concerning (A) the name of such foreign country or international organization, (B) the amount of such funds to be made available to such country or organization, and (C) the purpose for which such funds are to be made available to such country or organization; and

"(2) unless the Congress, within thirty legislative days after receiving any report under paragraph (1), adopts a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the provisions of the report provided by clauses (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1).

"(c) Of the amount authorized under subsection (a), not less than \$6,000,000 shall constitute a contribution by the United States toward the settlement of the deficit of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Middle East, if the President determines that a reasonable number of other countries will contribute a fair share toward the settlement of such deficit within a reasonable period of time after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1974. In determining such fair share, the President shall take into consideration the economic position of each such country. Such \$6,000,000 shall be in addition to any other contribution to such Agency by the United States pursuant to any other provision of law."

PROHIBITIONS AGAINST FURNISHING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 3. Section 620(p) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is repealed.

NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS

SEC. 4. None of the funds authorized by this Act may be used to finance the construction of, the operation of maintenance of, or the supply of fuel for any nuclear powerplant in Israel or Egypt, which has been approved under an agreement for cooperation between the United States and either such country.

TITLE II—INDOCHINA AID

ASSISTANCE TO INDOCHINA

SEC. 5. Section 802 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 802. AUTHORIZATION.—(a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to furnish assistance for relief and reconstruction of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos as authorized by this part for the fiscal year 1974 not to exceed \$504,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$575,400,000, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"(b) No assistance may be provided to South Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos under part I (including chapter 4 of part II) of

this Act. This prohibition may not be waived under section 614(a) of this Act or any other provision of law unless (1) the President, at least thirty days prior to the proposed waiver, submits to the Congress a statement containing the amount and source of the funds to be used under part I (including chapter 4 of part II), the use to which the funds are to be put, and his reasons for the use of the funds, and (2) during such thirty-day period the Congress does not by concurrent resolution disapprove the provision of such assistance.

"(c) The authority of section 610(a) of this Act may not be used to transfer funds into this part unless (1) the President, at least thirty days prior to the proposed transfer, determines and reports to the Congress that the transfer is important to the security of the United States and includes in his report the amount and source of the funds to be transferred, the use to which the funds are to be put, and his reasons why the transfer is important to the security of the United States, and (2) during such thirty-day period the Congress does not by concurrent resolution disapprove the transfer.

"(d) In addition to whatever funds may be made available under subsection (a) for the purposes of this subsection, there is also authorized to be appropriated \$27,700,000 for United States contribution to the International Commission of Control and Supervision of the Vietnam Peace Agreement."

ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAMESE CHILDREN

SEC. 6. Section 803(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by inserting after "fiscal year 1974, \$5,000,000," the following: "and for fiscal year 1975, \$10,000,000".

CEILING ON FERTILIZERS TO SOUTH VIETNAM

SEC. 7. (a) None of the moneys made available under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be used during fiscal year 1975 to procure agricultural fertilizers for, or to provide such fertilizers to, South Vietnam.

(b) During each fiscal year after fiscal year 1975, of the total amount obligated or expended for such fiscal year under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to procure agricultural fertilizers for, or to provide such fertilizers to, foreign countries, not more than one-third of such amount may be obligated or expended to procure such fertilizers for, or provide such fertilizers to, South Vietnam.

TITLE III—OTHER FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENTS

FOOD AND NUTRITION AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 8. Section 103 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$291,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1975 and 1975" and inserting "\$291,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, and \$471,300,000 for the fiscal year 1975" in lieu thereof.

POPULATION PLANNING AND HEALTH AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 9. Section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$145,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975" and inserting "\$145,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974 and \$165,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975" in lieu thereof.

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 10. Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 115. PROHIBITING USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—(a) None of the funds made available to carry out this chapter may be used in any fiscal year for any country to which assistance is furnished in such fiscal year under chapter 4 of part II (security supporting assistance), part V (assistance for relief and reconstruction of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos), or part VI (assistance for Middle East peace) of this Act.

H 11650

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD--HOUSE

December 11, 1974

"(b) The prohibition contained in subsection (a) may only be waived under section 614(a) of this Act or under any other provision of law—

"(1) if the President submits to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a statement containing (A) the amount of funds under this chapter to be made available which, but for such waiver, would have been prohibited from being made available, (B) the country for which such funds are to be made available, (C) the purpose for which such funds are to be made available for such country, and (D) the reason that funds from this chapter must be made available for such purpose; and

"(2) during the thirty-day period after the President submits such report, Congress does not pass a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the proposed use of such funds.

"(c) This section shall not apply to funds made available under section 104 for purposes of title X of chapter 2 of this part (programs relating to population growth)."

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT PROGRAMS

SEC. 11. (a) Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by deleting the title heading and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE III—HOUSING AND OTHER CREDIT GUARANTY PROGRAMS";

(2) by inserting at the end of section 222 the following new section:

"SEC. 222A. AGRICULTURAL AND PRODUCTIVE CREDIT AND SELF-HELP COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.—(a) It is the sense of the Congress that in order to stimulate the participation of the private sector in the economic development of less-developed countries in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be used to establish pilot programs in not more than five Latin American countries to encourage private banks, credit institutions, similar private lending organizations, cooperatives, and private nonprofit development organizations to make loans on reasonable terms to organized groups and individuals residing in a community for the purpose of enabling such groups and individuals to carry out agricultural credit and self-help community development projects for which they are unable to obtain financial assistance on reasonable terms. Agricultural credit and assistance for self-help community development projects should include, but not be limited to, material and such projects as wells, pumps, farm machinery, improved seed, fertilizer, pesticides, vocational training, food industry development, nutrition projects, improved breeding stock for farm animals, sanitation facilities, and looms and other handcraft aids.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the agency primarily responsible for administering part I is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as it shall determine, to private lending institutions, cooperatives, and private nonprofit development organizations in not more than five Latin American countries assuring against loss of not to exceed 50 per centum of the portfolio of such loans made by any lender to organized groups or individuals residing in a community to enable such groups or individuals to carry out agricultural credit and self-help community development projects for which they are unable to obtain financial assistance on reasonable terms. In no event shall the liability of the United States exceed 75 per centum of any one loan.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$15,000,000. Not

more than 10 per centum of such sum shall be provided for any one institution, cooperative, or organization.

"(d) The Inter-American Foundation shall be consulted in developing criteria for making loans eligible for guaranty coverage in Latin America under this section.

"(e) Not to exceed \$3,000,000 of the guaranty reserve established under section 223 (b) shall be available to make such payments as may be necessary to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under this section or any guaranties previously issued under section 240 of this Act.

"(f) Funds held by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation pursuant to section 236 may be available for meeting necessary administrative and operating expenses for carrying out the provisions of this section through June 30, 1976.

"(g) The Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall, upon enactment of this subsection, transfer to the agency primarily responsible for administering part I all obligations, assets, and related rights and responsibilities arising out of, or related to the predecessor program provided for in section 240 of this Act.

"(h) The authority of this section shall continue until December 31, 1977.

"(i) Notwithstanding the limitation in subsection (c) of this section, foreign currencies owned by the United States and determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be excess to the needs of the United States may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this section, including the discharge of liabilities under this subsection. The authority conferred by this subsection shall be in addition to authority conferred by any other provision of law to implement guaranty programs utilizing excess local currency.

"(j) The President shall, on or before January 15, 1976, make a detailed report to the Congress on the results of the programs established under this section, together with such recommendations as he may deem appropriate."

(3) by deleting "section 221 or section 222" in section 223(a) and inserting "section 221, 222, or 222A" in lieu thereof;

(4) by deleting "this title" in section 223 (b) and inserting "section 221 and section 222" in lieu thereof; and

(5) by deleting "section 221 or section 222" in section 223(d) and inserting "section 221, 222, or 222A" in lieu thereof.

(b) Title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out section 240.

HOUSING GUARANTIES

SEC. 12. Section 223(i) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1975" and inserting "June 30, 1976" in lieu thereof.

POPULATION GROWTH EARMARKING

SEC. 13. Section 292 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "\$130,000,000" and inserting "\$150,000,000" in lieu thereof.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 14. (a) Section 302(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out the words "for the fiscal year 1975, \$150,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year 1975, \$154,400,000".

(b) Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) Of the funds made available to carry out this chapter for fiscal year 1975, in addition to any other such funds to be made available for contributions to the International Atomic Energy Agency, not less than \$500,000 shall be made available to such Agency as technical assistance in kind.

"(h) For each fiscal year, no funds author-

ized to be appropriated under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be obligated or expended for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization until the President certifies to the Congress that such Organization (1) has adopted policies which are fully consistent with its educational, scientific and cultural objectives, and (2) has taken concrete steps to correct its recent actions of a primarily political character: *Provided*, That a reasonable amount of funds authorized under this section shall be made available in fiscal year 1975 to strengthen international procedures which are designed to prevent the unauthorized dissemination or use of nuclear materials. The President shall report to the Congress not later than July 1, 1975, concerning actions taken by the United States to strengthen the procedures described under the preceding sentence."

SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

SEC. 15. Chapter 1 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 502B. HUMAN RIGHTS.—(a) It is the sense of Congress that, except in extraordinary circumstances, the President shall substantially reduce or terminate security assistance to any government which engages in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, including torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; prolonged detention without charges; or other flagrant denials of the right to life, liberty, and the security of the person.

"(b) Whenever proposing or furnishing security assistance to any government falling within the provisions of paragraph (a), the President shall advise the Congress of the extraordinary circumstances necessitating the assistance.

"(c) In determining whether or not a government falls within the provisions of subsection (a), consideration shall be given to the extent of cooperation by such government in permitting an unimpeded investigation of alleged violations of internally recognized human rights by appropriate international organizations, including the International Committee of the Red Cross and any body acting under the authority of the United Nations or of the Organization of American States.

"(d) For purposes of this section, 'security assistance' means assistance under chapter 2 (military assistance) or chapter 4 (security supporting assistance) of this part, assistance under part V (Indochina Postwar Reconstruction) or part VI (Middle East Peace) of this Act, sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act, or assistance for public safety under this or any other Act."

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

SEC. 16. (a) Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) In section 504(a), strike out "\$512,500,000 for the fiscal year 1974" and insert in lieu thereof "\$745,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975, of which not less than \$100,000,000 shall be made available for Israel".

(2) In section 504(a), strike out "(other than training in the United States)" and insert in lieu thereof "(other than (1) training in the United States, or (2) for Western Hemisphere countries, training in the United States or in the Canal Zone)".

(3) In section 506(a), strike out "the fiscal year 1974" in each place it appears and insert in lieu thereof "the fiscal year 1975".

(4) In section 513—

(A) Strike out "AND LAOS" in the section heading and insert "LAOS, AND VIETNAM" in lieu thereof; and

(B) Add at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) After June 30, 1975, no military assistance shall be furnished by the United

States to Vietnam directly or through any other foreign country unless that assistance is authorized under this Act or the Foreign Military Sales Act."

(b) Section 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) by striking out "\$341,000,000" in subsection (a) and inserting "\$377,000,000" in lieu thereof.

(2) by striking out "1972" in subsection (a) and inserting "1975. Of that sum, there shall be available no more than \$200,000,000 for military assistance." in lieu thereof.

(3) by striking out "\$341,000,000" in subsection (b) and inserting "\$377,000,000" in lieu thereof.

(4) by striking out "1972" in subsection (b) and inserting "1975" in lieu thereof.

CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TRANSFER

SEC. 17. Section 511 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"It is the sense of Congress that the President should develop and propose as soon as possible at the appropriate international forum a United States draft international agreement for regulating the transfer of conventional weapons among the governments of the world."

SECURITY SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 18. Section 532 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year 1974 not to exceed \$125,000,000, of which not less than \$50,000,000 shall be available solely for Israel and inserting in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$585,000,000.

PROHIBITIONS ON AID TO NATIONS TRADING WITH NORTH VIETNAM

SEC. 19. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by inserting before the period in subsection (n) the following: ", unless the President determines that such loans, credits, guaranties, grants, other assistance, or sales are in the national interest of the United States".

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE

SEC. 20. Section 620(v) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is repealed.

SUSPENSION OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 21. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(x) All military assistance, all sales of defense articles and services (whether for cash or by credit, guaranty, or any other means), and all licenses with respect to the transportation of arms, ammunitions, and implements of war (including technical data relating thereto) to the Government of Turkey shall be suspended on the date of enactment of this subsection unless and until the President determines and certifies to the Congress that the Government of Turkey is in compliance with the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Foreign Military Sales Act, and any agreement entered into under such Acts, and that substantial progress toward agreement has been made regarding military forces in Cyprus.

SUSPENSION OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO CHILE

SEC. 22. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(y) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), all military assistance, all sales of defense articles and services (whether for cash or by credit, guaranty, or any other means), and all licenses with respect to the transportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war (including technical data relating thereto) to the Government of Chile under this or any other law shall be suspended for the period from the date of enactment of this subsection through the end of fiscal year 1975.

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of

paragraph (1), training may be furnished pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in the United States or the Canal Zone to members of the armed forces of Chile in an amount not to exceed \$800,000 for fiscal year 1975.

"(3) The provisions of subsection (y) (1) shall cease to apply when the President reports to the Congress that the Government of Chile has made and is continuing to make fundamental improvements in the observance and enforcement of internationally recognized human rights: *Provided*, That the total amount of credits furnished or guaranteed under the Foreign Military Sales Act, and of any disposal of vessels made in accordance with section 7307 of title X of the United States Code, to Chile during fiscal year 1975 shall not exceed \$10,000,000."

EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLE VALUE IN ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 23. Section 634(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "including economic assistance and military grants and sales" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "including economic assistance, military grants, and including for any such grant of any excess defense article, the value of such article expressed in terms of its acquisition cost to the United States), and military sales".

FAMINE OR DISASTER RELIEF

SEC. 24. (a) Section 639 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, dealing with famine or disaster relief, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 639. FAMINE OR DISASTER RELIEF.—Notwithstanding any other provision or this or any other Act, the President may provide famine or disaster relief assistance to any foreign country on such terms and conditions as he may determine. For fiscal year 1975 there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$40,000,000, to provide such assistance. The President shall submit quarterly reports during such fiscal year to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the programing and obligation of funds under this section."

(b) Of the funds appropriated to carry out section 639 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, during fiscal year 1975 not less than \$25,000,000 shall be made available to Cyprus for the purposes of such section 639.

(c) Section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, dealing with the contingency fund, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 451. CONTINGENCY FUND.—(a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$5,000,000, to provide assistance authorized by this part or by section 639 for any emergency purpose only in accordance with the provisions applicable to the furnishing of such assistance.

"(b) The President shall submit quarterly reports to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the programing and obligation of funds under this section.

"(c) No part of this fund shall be used to pay for any gifts to any officials of any foreign government made heretofore or hereafter."

CHANGE IN ALLOCATION OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

SEC. 25. Section 653 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by striking out all after the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (a); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and by inserting immediately after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no military grant assistance, security supporting assistance, assistance under chapter 1 of part I of this Act, or assistance under

part V of this Act, may be furnished to any country or international organization in any fiscal year, if such assistance exceeds by 10 percent or more the amount of such military grant assistance, security supporting assistance, assistance under chapter 1 of part I of this Act, or assistance under part V of this Act, as the case may be, set forth in the report required by subsection (a) of this section, unless—

"(1) the President reports to the Congress, at least thirty days prior to the date on which such excess funds are provided, the country or organization to be provided the excess funds, the amount and category of the excess funds, and the justification for providing the excess funds; and

"(2) in the case of military grant assistance or security supporting assistance, the President includes in the report under paragraph (1) his determination that it is in the security interests of the United States to provide the excess funds.

This subsection shall not apply if the excess funds provided in any fiscal year to any country or international organization for any category of assistance are less than \$1,000,000."

VOLUNTARY PERSONNEL IN CAMBODIA

SEC. 26. Section 656 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "This section shall not be construed to apply to employees of United States voluntary non-profit relief agencies registered with and approved by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid or to employees of the International Committee of the Red Cross."

REIMBURSABLE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND LIMITING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 27. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end of part III the following new sections:

"SEC. 659. REIMBURSABLE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.—The President is authorized to use up to \$2,000,000 of the funds made available for the purposes of this Act in each of the fiscal years 1975 and 1976 to work with friendly countries, especially those in which United States development programs have been concluded or those not receiving assistance under part I of this Act, in (1) facilitating open and fair access to natural resources of interest to the United States and (2) stimulation of reimbursable aid programs consistent with part I of this Act. Any funds used for purposes of this section may be used notwithstanding any other provision of this Act.

"SEC. 660. LIMITATION ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—(a) No funds appropriated under the authority of this or any other Act may be expended by or on behalf of the Central Intelligence Agency for operations in foreign countries, other than activities intended solely for obtaining necessary intelligence, unless and until the President finds that each such operation is important to the national security of the United States and reports, in a timely fashion, a description and scope of such operation to the appropriate committees of the Congress, including the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply during military operations initiated by the United States under a declaration of war approved by the Congress or an exercise of powers by the President under the War Powers Resolution."

LIMITATION ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES IN KOREA

SEC. 28. (a) The aggregate amount of—
(1) funds obligated or reserved for military assistance, including supply operations,

under chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(2) the acquisition cost of excess defense articles, if any, ordered under part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and not charged against appropriations for military assistance;

(3) credits, including participations in credits, extended pursuant to section 23 of the Foreign Military Sales Act; and

(4) the principal amount of loans guaranteed pursuant to section 24(a) of the Foreign Military Sales Act;

with respect to South Korea shall not exceed \$145,000,000 for fiscal year 1975 until the President submits a report to the Congress after the date of enactment of this Act stating that the government of South Korea is making substantial progress in the observance of internationally recognized standards of human rights.

(b) After the submission of the report under subsection (a), the aggregate amount described in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of such subsection with respect to South Korea shall not exceed \$165,000,000 for fiscal year 1975.

(c) The provisions of section 506 and section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or of any other law, may not be used to exceed the limitation under subsection (a) or (b).

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR INDIA

SEC. 29. The total amount of assistance provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and of credit sales made or guaranteed under the Foreign Military Sales Act for India shall not exceed \$50,000,000 in fiscal year 1975.

TITLE IV—FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 30. The Foreign Military Sales Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 3(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) A country shall remain ineligible in accordance with subsection (c) of this section until such time as the President determines that such violation has ceased, that the country concerned has given assurances satisfactory to the President that such violation will not recur, and that, if such violation involved the transfer of sophisticated weapons without the consent of the President, such weapons have been returned to the country concerned."

(2) In section 24(a) and section 24(b) the parenthetical phrase in each is amended to read: "(excluding United States Government agencies other than the Federal Financing Bank)".

(3) In section 31—

(A) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out "\$325,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$405,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975"; and

(B) Subsection (b) is amended by striking out "\$730,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, of which amount not less than \$300,000,000 shall be available to Israel only" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$772,500,000 for the fiscal year 1975, of which not less than \$200,000,000 shall be made available for Israel".

(4) In section 33—

(A) subsection (a) is repealed;

(B) subsection (b) is redesignated as subsection (a); and

(C) a new subsection (b) is added as follows:

"(b) The President may waive the limitations of this section when he determines it to be important to the security of the United States and promptly so reports to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate."

(5) Section 35(b) is repealed, and section 36 is amended by inserting before subsection (c) the following new subsections:

"(a) The President shall submit to the

Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate quarterly reports containing—

"(1) a listing of all letters of offer to sell any defense article or services under this Act, if such offer has not been accepted or canceled;

"(2) a cumulative listing of all such letters of offer to sell that have been accepted during the fiscal year in which such report is submitted;

"(3) the cumulative dollar amounts, by foreign country and international organization, of credit sales under section 23 and guaranty agreements under section 24 made before the submission of such quarterly report and during the fiscal year in which such report is submitted; and

"(4) projections of the cumulative dollar amounts, by foreign country and international organization, of credit sales under section 23 and guaranty agreements under section 24 to be made in the quarter of the fiscal year immediately following the quarter for which such report is submitted.

For each letter of offer to sell under paragraphs (1) and (2), the report shall specify (A) the foreign country or international organization to which the defense article or service is offered, (B) the dollar amount of the offer to sell under paragraph (1) or of the completed sale under paragraph (2), (C) a brief description of the defense article or service offered, (D) the United States armed force which is making the offer to sell, (E) the date of such offer, and (F) the date of any acceptance under paragraph (2).

"(b) In the case of any letter of offer to sell any defense articles or services under this Act for \$25,000,000 or more, before issuing such letter of offer the President shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a statement with respect to such offer to sell containing the information specified in subparagraphs (A) through (E) in subsection (a). The letter of offer shall not be issued if the Congress, within twenty legislative days after receiving any such statement, adopts a concurrent resolution stating in effect that it objects to such proposed sale, unless the President in his statement certifies that an emergency exists which requires such sale in the national security interests of the United States."

DEFINITION OF "VALUE" FOR FOREIGN MILITARY SALES

SEC. 31. Section 8(c) of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act, and for other purposes", approved January 12, 1971 (22 U.S.C. 2321b), is amended by inserting immediately before the period the following: "; except that for any excess defense article such term shall not include a value for any such article which is less than 33 1/3 percent of the amount the United States paid for such article when the United States acquired it".

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS AND MISCELLANEOUS

EXCHANGES OF NECESSARY OR STRATEGIC RAW MATERIALS

SEC. 32. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 661. EXCHANGES OF CERTAIN MATERIALS.—(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever the President determines it is in the United States national interest, he shall furnish assistance under this Act or shall furnish defense articles or services under the Foreign Military Sales Act pursuant to an agreement with the recipient of such assistance, articles, or services which provides that such recipient may only obtain such assistance, articles, or services in exchange for any necessary or strategic raw material controlled by such recipient. For the purposes of this section, the term 'necessary or strategic raw material' includes petroleum, other fossil fuels, metals, minerals, or any other natural substance which the President determines is in short supply in the United States.

"(b) The President shall allocate any necessary or strategic raw material transferred to the United States under this section to any appropriate agency of the United States Government for stockpiling, sale, transfer, disposal, or any other purpose authorized by law.

"(c) Funds received from any disposal of materials under subsection (b) shall be deposited as miscellaneous receipts in the United States Treasury."

GORGAS MEMORIAL INSTITUTE

SEC. 33. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial", approved May 7, 1928, is amended by striking out "\$500,000" and inserting "\$2,000,000" in lieu thereof.

INVOLVEMENT OF PUERTO RICO IN THE CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

SEC. 34. (a) The President may transmit to the Caribbean Development Bank an instrument stating that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has the authority to conclude an agreement of accession with such Bank and to assume rights and obligations pursuant to such agreement. However, such agreement may only be concluded after it has been approved by the United States Secretary of State.

(b) The instrument transmitted by the President to the Caribbean Development Bank under subsection (a) shall state that the United States shall not assume any financial or other responsibility for the performance of any obligation incurred by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico pursuant to such agreement of accession or pursuant to any other aspect of its membership or participation in such Bank.

(c) Such agreement of accession shall provide that the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico may not receive from the Caribbean Development Bank any funds provided to the Bank by the United States.

SEC. 35. It is the sense of the Congress that any country receiving assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which is in default, at least 90 days prior to the date of enactment of this Act, of any payment of principal or interest due on any loan or credit received from the United States shall promptly pay all such principal and interest. It is further the sense of the Congress that the President shall promptly enter into negotiations with each such country to help effectuate the payment of such principal and interest, or to effectuate the transfer by such country to the United States of goods, services, concessions, or actions beneficial to the United States, in lieu of the payment of such principal and interest.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 17234) was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendments to the Senate bill

December 11, 1974

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 11653

(S. 3394) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, ZABLOCKI, HAYS, FASCELL, FRELINGHUYSEN, BROOMFIELD, and DERWINSKI.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1283, FEDERAL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. UDALL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1283) to establish a national program for research, development, and demonstration in fuels and energy and for the coordination and financial supplementation of Federal energy research and development; and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 93-1563)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1283) to establish a national program for research, development, and demonstration in fuels and energy and for the coordination and financial supplementation of Federal energy research and development; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Nonnuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

"Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds that—

(a) The Nation is suffering from a shortage of environmentally acceptable forms of energy.

(b) Compounding this energy shortage is our past and present failure to formulate a comprehensive and aggressive research and development program designed to make available to American consumers our large domestic energy reserves including fossil fuels, nuclear fuels, geothermal resources, solar energy, and other forms of energy. This failure is partially because the unconventional energy technologies have not been judged to be economically competitive with traditional energy technologies.

(c) The urgency of the Nation's energy challenge will require commitments similar to those undertaken in the Manhattan and Apollo projects; it will require that the Nation undertake a research, development, and demonstration program in nonnuclear en-

ergy technologies with a total Federal investment which may reach or exceed \$20,000,000,000 over the next decade.

(d) In undertaking such program, full advantage must be taken of the existing technical and managerial expertise in the various energy fields within Federal agencies and particularly in the private sector.

(e) The Nation's future energy needs can be met if a national commitment is made now to dedicate the necessary financial resources, to enlist our scientific and technological capabilities, and to accord the proper priority to developing new nonnuclear energy options to serve national needs, conserve vital resources, and protect the environment.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 3. (a) It is the policy of the Congress to develop on an urgent basis the technological capabilities to support the broadest range of energy policy options through conservation and use of domestic resources by socially and environmentally acceptable means.

(b) (1) The Congress declares the purpose of this Act to be to establish and vigorously conduct a comprehensive, national program of basic and applied research and development, including but not limited to demonstrations of practical applications of all potentially beneficial energy sources and utilization technologies, within the Energy Research and Development Administration.

(2) In carrying out this program, the Administrator of the Energy Research and Development Administration (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Administrator") shall be governed by the terms of this Act and other applicable provisions of law with respect to all nonnuclear aspects of the research, development, and demonstration program; and the policies and provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) and other provisions of law shall continue to apply to the nuclear research, development, and demonstration program.

(3) In implementing and conducting the research, development, and demonstration programs pursuant to this Act, the Administrator shall incorporate programs in specific nonnuclear technologies previously enacted into law, including those established by the Solar Heating and Cooling Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-409), the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-410), and the Solar Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-473).

DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 4. The Administrator shall—

(a) review the current status of nonnuclear energy resources and current nonnuclear energy research and development activities, including research and development being conducted by Federal and non-Federal entities;

(b) formulate and carry out a comprehensive Federal nonnuclear energy research, development, and demonstration program which will expeditiously advance the policies established by this Act and other relevant legislation establishing programs in specific energy technologies;

(c) utilize the funds authorized pursuant to this Act to advance energy research and development by initiating and maintaining, through fund transfers, grants, or contracts, energy research, development and demonstration programs or activities utilizing the facilities, capabilities, expertise, and experience of Federal agencies, national laboratories, universities, nonprofit organizations, industrial entities, and other non-Federal entities which are appropriate to each type of research, development, and demonstration activity;

(d) establish procedures for periodic consultation with representatives of science, industry, environmental organizations, consumers and other groups who have special expertise in the areas of energy research development and technology; and

(e) initiate programs to design, construct, and operate energy facilities of sufficient size to demonstrate the technical and economic feasibility of utilizing various forms of nonnuclear energy.

GOVERNING PRINCIPLES

SEC. 5. (a) The Congress authorizes and directs that the comprehensive program in research, development, and demonstration required by this Act shall be designed and executed according to the following principles:

(1) Energy conservation shall be a primary consideration in the design and implementation of the Federal nonnuclear energy program. For the purposes of this Act, energy conservation means both improvement in efficiency of energy production and use, and reduction in energy waste.

(2) The environmental and social consequences of a proposed program shall be analyzed and considered in evaluating its potential.

(3) Any program for the development of a technology which may require significant consumptive use of water after the technology has reached the stage of commercial application shall include thorough consideration of the impacts of such technology and use on water resources pursuant to the provisions of section 13.

(4) Heavy emphasis shall be given to those technologies which utilize renewable or essentially inexhaustible energy sources.

(5) The potential for production of net energy by the proposed technology at the stage of commercial application shall be analyzed and considered in evaluating proposals.

(b) The Congress further directs that the execution of the comprehensive research, development, and demonstration program shall conform to the following principles:

(1) Research and development of nonnuclear energy sources shall be pursued in such a way as to facilitate the commercial availability of adequate supplies of energy to all regions of the United States.

(2) In determining the appropriateness of Federal involvement in any particular research and development undertaking, the Administrator shall give consideration to the extent to which the proposed undertaking satisfies criteria including, but not limited to, the following:

(A) The urgency of public need for the potential results of the research, development, or demonstration effort is high, and it is unlikely that similar results would be achieved in a timely manner in the absence of Federal assistance.

(B) The potential opportunities for non-Federal interests to recapture the investment in the undertaking through the normal commercial utilization of proprietary knowledge appear inadequate to encourage timely results.

(C) The extent of the problems treated and the objectives sought by the undertaking are national or widespread in their significance.

(D) There are limited opportunities to induce non-Federal support of the undertaking through regulatory actions, end use controls, tax and price incentives, public education, or other alternatives to direct Federal financial assistance.

(E) The degree of risk of loss of investment inherent in the research is high, and the availability or risk capital to the non-Federal entities which might otherwise engage in the field of the research is inadequate for the timely development of the technology.

H 11654

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

December 11, 1974

(F) The magnitude of the investment appears to exceed the financial capabilities of potential non-Federal participants in the research to support effective efforts.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AND PROGRAMING

SEC. 6. (a) Pursuant to the authority and directions of this Act and the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-438), the Administrator shall transmit to the Congress, on or before June 30, 1975, a comprehensive plan for energy research, development, and demonstration. This plan shall be appropriately revised annually as provided in section 15(a). Such plan shall be designed to achieve—

(1) solutions to immediate and short-term (to the early 1980's) energy supply system and associated environmental problems;

(2) solutions to middle-term (the early 1980's to 2000) energy supply system and associated environmental problems; and

(3) solutions to long-term (beyond 2000) energy supply system and associated environmental problems.

(b) (1) Based on the comprehensive energy research, development, and demonstration plan developed under subsection (a), the Administrator shall develop and transmit to the Congress, on or before June 30, 1975, a comprehensive nonnuclear energy research, development, and demonstration program to implement the nonnuclear research, development, and demonstration aspects of the comprehensive plan.

(2) This program shall be designed to achieve solutions to the energy supply and associated environmental problems in the immediate and short-term (to the early 1980's), middle-term (the early 1980's to 2000), and long-term (beyond 2000) time intervals. In formulating the nonnuclear aspects of this program, the Administrator shall evaluate the economic, environmental, and technological merits of each aspect of the program.

(3) The Administrator shall assign program elements and activities in specific nonnuclear energy technologies to the short-term, middle-term, and long-term time intervals, and shall present full and complete justification for these assignments and the degree of emphasis for each. These program elements and activities shall include, but not be limited to, research, development, and demonstrations designed—

(A) to advance energy conservation technologies, including but not limited to—

(i) productive use of waste, including garbage, sewage, agricultural wastes, and industrial waste heat;

(ii) reuse and recycling of materials and consumer products;

(iii) improvements in automobile design for increased efficiency and lowered emissions, including investigation of the full range of alternatives to the internal combustion engine and systems of efficient public transportation; and

(iv) advanced urban and architectural design to promote efficient energy use in the residential and commercial sectors, improvements in home design and insulation technologies, small thermal storage units and increased efficiency in electrical appliances and lighting fixtures;

(B) to accelerate the commercial demonstration of technologies for producing low-sulfur fuels for boiler use;

(C) to demonstrate improved methods for the generation, storage, and transmission of electrical energy through (i) advances in gas turbine technologies, combined power cycles, the use of low British thermal unit gas and, if practicable, magnetohydrodynamics; (ii) storage systems to allow more efficient load following, including the use of inertial energy storage systems; and (iii) improvement in cryogenic transmission methods;

(D) to accelerate the commercial demonstration of technologies for producing substitutes for natural gas, including coal gasification: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall invite and consider proposals from potential participants based upon Federal assistance and participation in the form of a joint Federal-industry corporation, and recommendations pursuant to this clause shall be accompanied by a report on the viability of using this form of Federal assistance or participation;

(E) to accelerate the commercial demonstration of technologies for producing syn-crude and liquid petroleum products from coal: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall invite and consider proposals from potential participants based upon Federal assistance and participation through guaranteed prices or purchase of the products, and recommendations pursuant to this clause shall be accompanied by a report on the viability of using this form of Federal assistance or participation;

(F) in accordance with the program authorized by the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-410), to accelerate the commercial demonstration of geothermal energy technologies;

(G) to demonstrate the production of syn-crude from oil shale by all promising technologies including in situ technologies;

(H) to demonstrate new and improved methods for the extraction of petroleum resources, including secondary and tertiary recovery of crude oil;

(I) to demonstrate the economics and commercial viability of solar energy for residential and commercial energy supply applications in accordance with the program authorized by the Solar Heating and Cooling Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-409);

(J) to accelerate the commercial demonstration of environmental control systems for energy technologies developed pursuant to this Act;

(K) to investigate the technical and economic feasibility of tidal power for supplying electrical energy;

(L) to commercially demonstrate advanced solar energy technologies in accordance with the Solar Research, Development and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-473);

(M) to determine the economics and commercial viability of the production of synthetic fuels such as hydrogen and methanol;

(N) to commercially demonstrate the use of fuel cells for central station electric power generation;

(O) to determine the economics and commercial viability of in situ coal gasification;

(P) to improve techniques for the management of existing energy systems by means of quality control; application of systems analysis, communications, and computer techniques; and public information with the objective of improving the reliability and efficiency of energy supplies and encourage the conservation of energy resources; and

(Q) to improve methods for the prevention and cleanup of marine oil spills.

FORMS OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 7. (a) In carrying out the objectives of this Act, the Administrator may utilize various forms of Federal assistance and participation which may include but are not limited to—

(1) joint Federal-industry experimental, demonstration, or commercial corporations consistent with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section;

(2) contractual arrangements with non-Federal participants including corporations, consortia, universities, governmental entities, and nonprofit institutions;

(3) contracts for the construction and operation of federally owned facilities;

(4) Federal purchases at guaranteed price of the products of demonstration plants or activities consistent with the provisions of subsection (c) of the section;

(5) Federal loans to non-Federal entities conducting demonstrations of new technologies; and

(6) incentives including financial awards, to individual inventors, such incentives to be designed to encourage the participation of a large number of such inventors.

(b) Joint Federal-industry corporations proposed for congressional authorization pursuant to this Act shall be subject to the provisions of section 9 of this Act and shall conform to the following guidelines except as otherwise authorized by Congress:

(1) Each such corporation may design, construct, operate, and maintain one or more experimental, demonstration, or commercial-scale facilities, or other operations which will ascertain the technical, environmental, and economic feasibility of a particular energy technology. In carrying out this function, the corporation shall be empowered, either directly or by contract, to utilize commercially available technologies, perform tests, or design, construct, and operate pilot plants, as may be necessary for the design of the full-scale facility.

(2) Each corporation shall have—

(A) a Board of nine directors consisting of individuals who are citizens of the United States, of whom one shall be elected annually by the Board to serve as Chairman. The Board shall be empowered to adopt and amend bylaws. Five members of the Board shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and four members of the Board shall be appointed by the President on the basis of recommendations received by him from any non-Federal entity or entities entering into contractual arrangements to participate in the corporation;

(B) a President and such other officers and employees as may be named and appointed by the Board (with the rates of compensation of all officers and employees being fixed by the Board); and

(C) the usual powers conferred upon corporations by the laws of the District of Columbia.

(3) An appropriate time interval, not to exceed 12 years, shall be established for the term of Federal participation in the corporation, at the expiration of which the Board of Directors shall take such action as may be necessary to dissolve the corporation or otherwise terminate Federal participation and financial interests. In carrying out such dissolution, the Board of Directors shall dispose of all physical facilities of the corporation in such manner and subject to such terms and conditions as the Board determines are in the public interest and consistent with existing law; and a share of the appraised value of the corporate assets proportional to the Federal participation in the corporation, including the proceeds from the disposition of such facilities, on the date of its dissolution, after satisfaction of all its legal obligations, shall be made available to the United States and deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. All patent rights of the corporation shall, on such date of dissolution, be vested in the Administrator: *Provided*, That Federal participation may be terminated prior to the time established in the authorizing Act upon recommendation of the Board of Directors.

(4) Any commercially valuable product produced by demonstration facilities shall be disposed of in such manner and under such terms and conditions as the corporation shall prescribe. All revenues received by the corporation from the sale of such products shall be available to the corporation for use by it in defraying expenses incurred in connection